Notes on the Rise of Non-apical *r* in Dutch: Denying the French Connection

Robert B. Howell
University of Wisconsin, Madison

The question of the origin of the *r* form commonly referred to as *de brouwende r* in Dutch has long intrigued historical linguists. It has seemed difficult on phonetic grounds to motivate the replacement in some parts of the Dutch linguistic area of the tongue tip post-dental trilled or flapped *r*, inherited from Proto-Germanic, with this new and to some minds grotesque uvular *r* articulated at the back of the oral cavity. For this reason one of the most popular and resilient theories about the origin of this back *r* form in Dutch, and indeed in the Germanic languages in general, has been that it represents not an internal development but rather the importation of Parisian French *r grasseyé* during the late 17th and the early 18th centuries. Rigorous examination of the argument supporting the Parisian *r* hypothesis will show, however, that it is based primarily on extra-linguistic evidence while some rather crucial direct evidence indicating that the *brouwende r* was a native Dutch innovation is ignored.

The author of the original Parisian *r* hypothesis, the 19th century German philologist Moritz Trautmann, suggested that adoption of the French *r* represents just one more manifestation of the imitation of the French court, French language and French custom in which the German upper classes indulged in the late 17th and 18th centuries. Although Trautmann himself frankly admits that he lacks any link through which it might be demonstrated, either directly or indirectly, that uvular *r* came to the Germanic linguistic area from France (1880.219), his theory nevertheless seems at first blush to have much in its favor and has suffered no lack of proponents among *Neerlandici*. One of the most recent histories of the Dutch language states flatly "when the uvular or velar *r* spread all over Europe from France, particularly in the 18th century, it did not miss the Netherlands and Belgium (Donaldson:1983.54)." This hypothesis is unfortunately fraught with weaknesses. Careful consideration of the linguistic facts surrounding the development of uvular *r* in various parts of the linguistic area will allow us to reclaim the brouwende *r* as a native Dutch innovation.

The Parisian *r* hypothesis is based on three essential assumptions, all of which must prove correct if the hypothesis is to be accepted. The first and most crucial of these assumptions is that the pronunciation of *r* in fashionable Parisian French changed from an apical trill to a guttural trill in the late 17th century. This back *r* type was typical of *parler gras*, "speaking fat", from which the term *r grasseyé* derives. A second assumption holds that the imitation of French culture rampant in upper class circles in the Low Countries in the 17th and 18th centuries has left its imprint on the Dutch language. The Parisian *r* (or *brouwende r*), incorporated into the language as a prestige pronunciation, represents but one example of this French influence. Finally, the back *r* forms in Dutch seem to originate in and radiate from urban centers such as the Hague---places where knowledge of the French language was most widespread. However attractive and reasonable such assumptions may seem it will become clear upon further discussion that they provide no plausible evidence that the Dutch uvular *r* was imported from France.

Perhaps the most striking weakness of the Parisian *r* hypothesis lies in its absolute failure to demonstrate that French had developed a back *r* form by the late 17th century. In his extensive discussion of the decline of apical *r* in Europe, Wollock (1983: 195-196) makes clear that Chapelle uses the term *parler gras* in his account of a journey through

France in 1656 to describe the affected speech of upper class ladies in Montpellier. But satirical plays of the period obviously demonstrate that *parler gras* signified the regular replacement of apical *r* by *l*. Thus Poisson's satire of the pronunciation of a Parisian viscountess in the comedy *L'après soupé des auberges* of 1665, which he characterizes as *parler gras*, shows her substituting *l* for *r*: *touzoul* for *toujours*, *levenois* for *revenais*, *Touls* for *Tours*, etc.(quoted in Lancaster 1934). Clearly the 17th century term *parler gras* can not simply be equated with the modern term *r grasseyé*. Indeed, the modifiers *gras* and *grasseyé* are exceedingly vague from the standpoint of any phonetic value they are supposed to represent. As the author of the origin Parisian *r* hypothesis, Trautmann simply sought a definition of the term *parler gras* from Littré's dictionary of 1877. Although Littré (X, 1920-21) provides two definitions, Wollock (198-199) points out that Trautmann apparently arbitrarily accepted the first in which Littré states that *parler gras* consists of the pronunciation of a *roulement guttural* in words in which *r* appears (*véritable grasseyement*). Trautmann ignores a second definition offered by Littré in which he characterizes those who *parlent gras* as 'having difficulty pronouncing the letter *r*, and they often substitute for it the letter *l*' (*grasseyement affecté*). Clearly this second definition describes the use of *l* for *r* found in the affected upper class speech of Paris in the late 17th century commented on by Chapelle and parodied by Poisson. There is in this period no sign of the uvular *r* form in French that speakers of Dutch are supposed to have imitated, a fact which is generally recognized in historical grammars of French (e.g., Dauzat: 1930.122) where the introduction of the uvular *r* is generally placed in the mid to late 18th century. Unfortunately, Germanicists have tended to accept Trautmann's unsubstantiated view that a uvular *r* was present in French in the 17th century. This apparently erroneous assumption has in turn been applied to the history of *r* in the various Germanic languages, Dutch included, with the result that the supposed borrowing of back *r* forms from French into Germanic has become a commonly cited paradigm example of a phonological loan.

Despite this potentially fatal flaw in the hypothesis, some of the sociolinguistic questions it raises are worthy of discussion. One of the more attractive aspects of the Parisian *r* theory is that the acceptance of an imported French uvular *r* would seem to parallel the enthusiastic adoption of French words and customs by the upper classes in the Netherlands during the 17th and 18th centuries. Nevertheless, while it would be foolish to underestimate the strength of French influence in the Netherlands, it would also be foolish to assume that acceptance of French fashion or even of French words into the Dutch lexicon necessarily implies that there was ever any tendency to impose phonetic characteristics of French on the pronunciation of Dutch. It is well known that the lexical stock of a language is far more sucsceptible to influence from another language than is its phonological system.[1]

Of course one can not ignore the fact that, in the upper classes at least, knowledge and use of French was quite common in the Netherlands of the 17th and 18th centuries. This widespread knowledge of French led to the wholesale incorporation of French words into the Dutch lexicon. Brutal parodies of the misuse and overuse of French lexical items in spoken Dutch to effect a more elevated style are found in the literature of both the 17th and 18th centuries. Huygens has a dandy from the Hague spout the following verse in his *Voorhout*:

Mijn soulas, mijn vreugden-voedsel,
Ah! quitteert U.E. la Cour?
Sult ghy eewigh absenteeren?
('k Schat de Meid naer Leiden voer.)
Wilt mijn flames obligeren
Melt een expedit retour. (De Vooys: 1952.90)

Similar exaggerated use of French vocabulary is used to humorous effect by Bredero in his *Spaanse Brabander*. This type of parody extends into the 18th century, as in the following wedding poem by Jan de Kruyf (1753):

Bruigom! onder reverentie,
Oordeel niet te prematuur:
Maar verleen me eerst audientie
In dit convenabel uur.
'k Noem 't met reden convenabel,
Wijl 't toch schijnt gedestineerd
(Tedieus of agreabel
Blijft hier ongedecideerd)
Om uw aandacht te enclaveeren
aan 't celest der Poezy. (De Vooys: 1952.132)

This type of satire coupled with the obvious acceptance and retention of a multitude of French loan words in everyday usage clearly indicates the tremendous influence of the French language on Dutch during this period. Nevertheless it is remarkable that such parody gives no indication that affected speech was characterized by the incorporation of French pronunciation as well as by the overuse of French words. It is of crucial importance to weigh the nature of the linguistic contact between French and Dutch before an innovation in the Dutch phonetic system based on a French model is posited. Lexical borrowing is notoriously weak evidence for the kind of intimate linguistic contact that would affect the grammatical structures of the languages involved. Above all it would be necessary to demonstrate that there were in the Netherlands large groups of true Dutch/ French bilinguals, a state of affairs that De Vooys describes as "een voorwaarde voor diepgaande ontlening" (133).[2]

In his extensive commentary on the nature of the French-Dutch linguistic contact, Salverda de Grave (1926) emphasizes that the actual influence of French in the Netherlands must not be overestimated. Use of French remained to a great extent confined to the upper social classes and even here the primary contact with the French language came through written texts. The largest body of French immigrants in the Netherlands, the French protestant refugees who left France as a result of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, almost certainly did not yet possess a uvular *r*. Their assimilation also proceeded rapidly. As Salverda de Grave states, "les réfugiés protestants s'étaient presque entièrement assimilés à leur entourage et étaient devenus Hollandais de langue" (1926.9). He goes on to note that by the 18th century France was poorly represented in Dutch professional life and that

Frenchmen's journeys through the Netherlands tended to be infrequent, short in duration and that they "ne suffisaient pas à créer des rapports durables" (9). It is important to emphasize that the presence of French in, for example, the numerous *Waalsekerken* in Dutch cities is not to be denied. It does however seem unlikely that the average speaker of Dutch, even in the urban centers could have had extensive daily intimate contact with French spoken by native speakers.

Given this linguistic situation, it would seem far more reasonable to contend that the language that underwent the greatest structural modification was the French spoken by the Dutch in the Netherlands during the 17th and 18th centuries. Adult learners of second languages generally impose the morphological, syntactic and above all the phonological structure of their own native language upon that of that of the target language. The more diluted the contact with native speakers of the target language, the more tenacious is the influence of the mother tongue.[3] There is a fair amount of evidence indicating that the French language did suffer in the mouths of the Dutch. Salverda de Grave notes that French in the Netherlands seems to have had a *vie indépendante* resulting in a brand of French that Voltaire termed *français refugié* . It is this 'independent life' which accounts for "ces mots et expressions pseudo-français, qui sont familiers aux Hollandais et font l'étonnement des Français (10). " The butchery of the French language in the Netherlands is bemoaned already in the 17th century by Huygens in a poem about a gentleman who speaks "niet fijn Frans, maar sijn Frans " (De Vooys: 1952.90). Under these circumstances it seems difficult to justify the view that large numbers of speakers of Dutch incorporated a sub-phonemic phonetic feature of French into their own native tongue. This view becomes all the more suspect when one takes into account the fact that uvular *r* probably did not even exist in French at this early date and that the average speaker of Dutch could have had but scant exposure to the French *r* in any event. The phonetic realization of French loan words in Modern Dutch would indicate little concern for retention of the original French pronunciation. Loan words have in many instances been drastically altered in order to conform to the demands of the Dutch phonological system: *courant* > *krant*, *salade* > *sla*.[4]

One of the most commonly cited sources of support for the Parisian *r* theory is the claim that the introduction of back *r* variants represents an "urban phenomenon". That is to say, the back *r* seems be introduced in urban centers where knowledge of French in the upper classes is most prevalent, and to spread from these urban centers to the surrounding countryside as a prestige pronunciation. The classic example of the urban (and hence supposedly French) origin of uvular *r* in Dutch is the back *r* found in the Hague, which does indeed represent an island of *brouwers* in the midst of an apical *r* area. However the sociolinguist and the dialectologist have long recognized that successful (i.e., expansive) linguistic innovations in general tend to emanate from urban centers. Expanded usage of back *r* forms in the Dutch linguistic area could only be expected to have originated in one or more urban centers. If a rural dialect were to develop an indigenous uvular r (and there is extensive evidence indicating that such independent developments are common) there would be little reason to expect the innovation to expand far beyond its area of origin.[5] On the other hand it is curious that the supposedly prestigous uvular *r* of the Hague was never adopted in Amsterdam, the economic and cultural center of the Netherlands.

A further problem with the view that the *brouwende r* represents a refined urban prestige pronunciation is the total lack of evidence that the uvular flap or trill was held in any esteem whatsoever until the late 19th century. B.C. Donaldson, a supporter of the Parisian *r* hypothesis, eloquently concedes the point: "It is paradoxical that uvular *r*, which originally started to replace dental *r* because it was considered socially more acceptable at a time when French manners, dress, and speech swept across Europe, should now have become the norm and that dental r is now considered by many to be more chic and correct; elocution and singing teachers, for example, recommend the dental sound as 'nicer' and clearer'" (Donaldson:1983. 54). It seems likely, however, that the origin of Donaldson's paradox can be found in his proposed explanation of the history of uvular *r* in Dutch rather than in any actual dramatic shift in the status of back *r* forms. The etymology of *brouwen* points to a more humble origin than the Parisian *r* hypothesis envisions. The *Woordenboek der Nederlandse taal* relates *brouwen* to the synonymous word *brijen*, which it defines as "spreken alsof men brij in de mond heeft." Both terms for speaking with a back *r* form are characterized as local, deviant pronunciation which should be viewed as incorrect. The same judgment seems to be made in the Goudse taunt hurled at *brouwers*: "MoedeR mag ik bRouwe leeRe? Jaa kint, bRau maaR; Roep ie bRoeRtie AaRie maaR. AaRie, AaRie, moedeR Roept! [<R> = [R]]" (Lafeber: 1967.21). It is not inconceivable that a once prestigious pronunciation could have fallen so far, but in the absence of the slightest shred of evidence indicating that back *r* ever was fashionable in Dutch (until recently), it must be viewed as a substandard innovation that has overcome substantial resistance on its way toward its current acceptable status. All too often the word *prestige* is without question applied to the speech patterns of the wealthiest classes in a linguistic community regardless of whether these speech patterns really are viewed as prestigious by the society as a whole. Linguistic characteristics which are considered correct or refined from a prescriptive perspective often do not prove to be particularly successful diachronically.

Refutation of the Parisian *r* hypothesis, of course, brings us no closer to an explanation of the origin of the *brouwende r* in Dutch. Before positing the rather uncommon importation of a new phonetic realization for a liquid into Dutch from a neighboring language, French, it does seem prudent to consider the possibility that the uvular *r* developed indigenously in the Germanic linguistic area. From a typological standpoint the independent development of a back *r* variant is not at all bizarre. Natural diachronic phonetic processes must, after all, account for geographically isolated instances of back *r* forms in, for example, Northumbrian English, southern Swedish (Sjöstedt:1936) and in remote rural German dialects of Carinthia (Kranzmeyer:1950.121). Furthermore, there is considerable evidence indicating that back *r* forms were present in Germanic long before the "Parisian r" is supposed to have become common in seventeenth century French. Penzl (1961) cites two examples of impure rhymes which indicate that the velar fricative /x/ and the liquid /r/ were phonetically close in German as early as the 14th century: Oswald von Wolkenstein (1377-1455) rhymes *macht* with *kart* and Jakob Ayer (1543-1603) rhymes *hart* with *anbracht*. Unless we assume that orthographic <ch> and <r> share a common point of articulation, these rhymed pairs are very difficult to explain. In his grammar of Bavarian, Weinhold (1867:170-171) also provides orthographic evidence for a uvular *r* form in Bavarian/Austrian in at least some of the contextual variants of the

phoneme /r/ from the 14th century onward: *darch* 'der', *warch* 'war', *Earchd* 'Erde', *Wearchd* 'Wert'. Furthermore Moulton (1952.86) cites Jacob Böhme's (1575-1624) description of the articulation of his *r* --- an *r* which can only be interpreted as uvular: "Das Wort ERDEN stösset vom Hertzen [begins with a vowel], und fasset sich am hinteren Theil über der Zungen, im hinteren Gaumen [medio- or post-velar closure], und zittert [is trilled]: es braucht sich aber die Zunge [i.e., tongue-tip] zu der ersten Sylben ER nicht [tongue tip is at bottom of the mouth not participating in the articulation]..." Given such evidence for a uvular *r* in German prior to the 17th century, it seems likely that back *r* forms developed independently in Germanic languages from a very early date and resulted from the operation of natural diachronic phonetic processes.

The nature of the processes which might result in the development of an original apical trill or flap *r* into a back variant has been discussed fairly extensively in the literature on Germanic *r* (Lass 1983, Howell 1985, 1987). One common factor in the development of back *r* variants seems to be the weakening and partial/total vocalization of *r* variants in the syllable coda, particularly when the post-vocalic *r* is itself followed by a consonant. This vocalization process entails the loss or drastic reduction of the primary articulation (apical trill or flap) which results in a vowel-like *r*. This vocalization process is exceedingly common in dialects of German, Dutch, English and Scandinavian languages as the following representative data indicate:

Southern Swedish: *rC* >*ɒC:*
pɔɔt 'port', *ɔɔt* 'ort' (Virestad); *vɛɔs* 'vers', *loɔs* 'Lars' (Loushalt); *vɛɔkə* 'virke', *lækə* 'lärke' (Hällaryd) (Sjöstedt: 1936.99, 102, 130).

German Dialects:
Courl (near Dortmund): *erC* > *iɛ(r)C:* (word-initial(#) *r* = [r])
viɛrk 'Werk', *kiɛrvə* 'Kerbe', *hiɛt* 'Herz', *stiɛt* 'Schwanz' (compare Du. *staart*)
(Beisenherz:1907.33).
Südmähren (Bavarian): *arC* > *ɑɛC:* (#*r* = [r])
stɑɛk 'stark', *sɑɛf* 'scharf', *pɑɛd* 'Bart' (Beranek:1936.46).
Darmstadt: *ir/er* > *ɐɐ* ; *ur/or* > *ɑɑ* (#*r* = [R])
bɐɐg 'Berg', *ɐɐ* 'ihr' *hɐɐn* 'Hirn', *dɑɑf* 'Dorf', *dɑɑšt* 'Durst' (Born:1938.16-18).
Ziegenhain (Hessian): ĕrC > ɐ̃(r)C (#*r* = [r])
hɐ̃t 'Herd', *wɐ̃t* 'Wert', *gɐ̃n* 'gern', *wɐ̃rk* 'Werk' (Corell:1936.93).
Wissenbach (Nassau): *erC* > e^{a}*(r)C* (#*r* =[r])
e^{a}*rwə* 'Erbe', *fe*^{a}*rdix* 'fertig', *gē*^{a}*də* 'Gerte' (Kroh:1915.73).
Warmsroth (Rhine-Mosel Franconian): *erC* > *ɐɔC* (#*r* = [ʁ])
ɐɔnst 'ernst', sdɐɔvə 'sterben', vɐɔk 'Werk' (Martin:1922.16).
Siebenburg: *erC* >*ɔɔ(r)C* (#*r* = [r])
pɛɔ(r)g 'Berg', *ɑɔrt/ɑɔt* 'Ort' (Obernberger:1964.50).
Kirchwerder (near Hamburg): *Vr* > *V* ^{a} (#*r* = [r])
hi ^{a} 'hier', *ɐ* ^{a}*tsoiga* 'Erzeuger', *bē*^{a}*n* 'Beeren' (Von Essen:1964).

Dutch dialects:
Elten-Bergic: *Vr > V*
kɛnə 'karnen', *zvat* 'zwart' (Zwardemaker & Eijkman:1928.206).
East Flemish: *VrC > VC/V̆(r)C*
kʌst 'korst', *pɛ.art* 'paard' (Blancquaert:1950.114).
Brabant: *VrC > V.C*
kʌst 'korst', *pjæ.t/pjɛ.t* 'paard' (Blancquaert:1950.114).
Limburg: *VrC > VRC~VC*
pɛəRt and *pjɑt* 'paard' (Blancquaert:1950.114).

Because the liquid *r* is characterized by complex coarticulations, secondary articulatory features of the original *r* remain despite the loss of the primary articulation. Investigations of the phonetic nature of the vocalized *r* variants have indicated that one common feature of these forms is constriction in the velar/uvular area. This constriction at the rear of the oral cavity is described precisely in Ulbrich (1972.56): "Die Zunge liegt bei relativ geringer Mundöffnung fast flach und breit im Unterkiefer in annähernder [a]-Stellung.....die Hinterzunge hat die Tendenz, sich dem velar-uvularem Bereich anzunähern....Bei nur geringfügiger weiterer Annäherung der Hinterzunge durch leichte dorsale Aufwölbung an das Velum oder die Uvula entsteht das hintere frikative *r* ; bei grösserer Öffnungsweite resultiert der Vokal [a]." Interestingly enough, in those dialects of Germanic in which the phoneme /r/ has both apical and uvular contextual variants, the uvular variants are found only in the syllable coda, precisely where the vocalized *r* described above tends to develop (see Zhirmunskiĭ:1962.377; Sjöstedt:1936.306). Once a back *r* form has been introduced in certain contexts, its extension to other positions (such as the syllable onset) would seem an natural development.

This particular line of argumentation is particularly relevant in the case of modern Dutch since many speakers of Dutch exhibit a velar approximant *r* form in this post-vocalic position. Mees and Collins (1982.9-10) describe this post-vocalic *r* quite precisely: "for both alveolar and uvular /r/ speakers, word-final /r/ is often a type of pre-velar approximant with the back of the tongue and the root retracted, giving rise to pseudo-retroflex resonance." As in Ulbrich's description of the German vocalized *r* forms cited above, a very slight additional raising of the tongue would result in the development of the approximant *r* to a back fricative velar or uvular *r* . Since the weakened approximant *r* variants are common both to alveolar and uvular *r* speakers in the syllable coda it seems altogether likely that the approximant *r* could represent an intermediate stage in the development from all-alveolar to all-uvular articualtion of the phoneme /r/ in Dutch. The development might be schematized as follows:

Diachronic stages in the introduction of back r variants in Dutch

	r in syllable onset	*r* in syllable coda
stage 1	alveolar [r] or [ɹ]	alveolar [r] or [ɹ]
stage 2	alveolar [r] or [ɹ]	approximant [ɹ]
stage 3	uvular [R] or [ʁ]	approximant [ɹ]
stage 4	uvular [R] or [ʁ]	uvular [R] or [ʁ]

This rough sequence for the indigenous development of back *r* variants in Dutch seems completely plausible. Stage 1 is the generally accepted phonetic value assigned to /r/ in early Germanic dialects.[6] At present, all four stages are found in speakers of Dutch although stages 1 and 2 appear to be losing ground to stages 3 and 4. Clearly stages 2-4 reflect innnovations in the realization of variants of the original Germanic /r/ , with stage 2 representing the least radical alteration and stage 4 representing the most radical. Stages 2 and 3 share the velar approximant *r* variant in the syllable coda, a segment which can be characterized by the feature [+ back]. In stage 3, however, this backness has been extended to the /r/ variants in the syllable onset, the crucial development in the eventual adoption of the back *r* . Since the back approximant *r* can clearly exist as a contextual variant of both alveolar /r/ and uvular /R/, it seems likely that it may have played a major role in the development of back *r* forms in Dutch.

This discussion by no means represents the first doubt cast on the "Parisian r" hypothesis in Dutch and Germanic. Nevertheless, the popularity of the hypothesis and its continued often unquestioned acceptance in the linguistic literature provide ample justification for renewed discussion of the facts. There is no doubt that the extent of French influence on language and custom in the Germanic linguistic area lends a certain common sense appeal to the claim that back *r* forms in Germanic languages represent a direct import of a fashionable French pronunciation. Common sense, however, also tells us that the earth is flat and only by careful scrutiny of all available data have we been able to prove otherwise in the course of the centuries. Careful study of languages in contact has shown that certain components of language are relatively open to influence from other languages (e.g., the lexicon) while other components remain far more resistant to external influence (e.g., syntax, morphology, phonology). Before depicting a given phonological innovation as the result of linguistic contact, it is therefore necessary to provide concrete evidence for such profound influence. The Parisian *r* hypothesis, however, seems to be based on little more than the casual observation that many things French have enjoyed considerable popularity in the Low Countries over the years. Indigenous development resulting from inherited internal phonetic and phonotactic characteristics of Dutch must therefore be considered a more likely source of the back *r* variants. Because evidence supporting such an internal evidence does seem to be forthcoming, the hypothesis that a French *r grasseyé* has been imported by speakers of Dutch should be rejected as unproven and improbable.

Notes

[1] A modern example might serve to underscore the rarity of phonetic loans as opposed to lexical borrowings. Although speakers of Dutch are constantly bombarded by English on television, in films, on the radio, in music and indeed in school the effect of English seems to be limited solely to lexical borrowings. As far as pronunciation is concerned, loan words from English are adapted to the Dutch phonological system, not pronounced as they are in the source language, English. Surely the average Dutch speaker is at present subject to far more exposure to English (certainly a prestige language in broad segments of the population) spoken by native speakers than ever could have been the case for French. See Van Coetsem (forthcoming) for extensive discussion of the specific results of various kinds of linguistic contact.

[2] A 'true bilingual is a speaker who has native competence in both languages, i.e., a speaker who has spoken both languages from earliest childhood. Such speakers should be distinguished from 'functional bilinguals', speakers who may master many of a second language's subsystems (e.g., lexicon, syntax, morphology) but would be immediately recognized as non-native by a native speaker. Henry Kissinger is functionally bilingual in English and German although a native speaker of English immediately classifies his English as non-native on the basis of his rather marked accent.

[3] The importance of 'immersion' in a foreign language has long been recognized by language instructors. Despite the best efforts of language teachers and despite technological advances such as the tape recorder, which provide students with extensive samples of native pronunciation, a second language learner rarely attains better than barely acceptable pronunciation in the target language prior to an extended period of residence abroad. It would seem counterintuitive to assume that speakers of Dutch in the 17th century succeeded (even after extensive exposure to spoken French) not only in mastering the French liquid /r/ but also incorporated it into their pronunciation of Dutch--especially since the liquids /l/ and /r/ traditionally rank among the most difficult phonemes to master in a foreign language.

[4] Of course loan words generally are altered to fit the phonological structure of the borrowing language, so these examples of French loan words in Dutch simply reflect the expected development.

[5] Interestingly enough, the French uvular *r* has been very slow to gain a foothold in Germanic dialects found in areas where French is the official language. Payen (1979.111) makes the following comments about the advent of a uvular fricative [R] in the German dialect spoken in Hilbesheim in Lorraine: "On peut observer là un phénomène en cours d'evolution, car il touche différemment les diverses générations. Ce sont les plus jeunes qui utilisent systématiquement la spirante uvulaire [R], en toutes positions, dans [sic] doute sous l'influence de l'école...Les personnes d'âge moyen savent l'employer en parlant le français, mais conservent [r] apical vibrant en dialecte. Les plus agés et ceux qui possèdent le français de manière rudimentaire utilisent [r] apical vibrant partout, en particulier dans les signifiants français intégrés aux énoncés dialectaux."

Clear examples of independent, phonetically motivated introduction of uvular *r* variants in geographically isolated non-urban dialect areas are very common. See, for example, Kranzmeyer (1956, ¶50) for uvular *r* in the German dialect of Upper Carinthia. See also

Sjöstedt (1936.306) for the development of uvular *r* in rural dialects of southern Swedish in subsequent generations.

[6] I have here no intention of minimizing the importance of the work of those linguists who posit a uvular [R] realization for Proto-Germanic */r/. I have, however, discussed my objections to this position at length elsewhere (Howell 1985, 1987) and see little sense in restating these arguments here. For evidence supporting the uvular [R] in early Germanic see Runge 1973, 1974.

References

Beisenherz, Heinrich. 1907. *Vokalismus der Mundart des nordöstlichen Landkreis Dortmund.* Borna-Leipzig: Noske.

Beranek, Franz. 1936. *Die Mundart von Südmähren.* (Beiträge zur Kenntnis sudetendeutscher Mundarten, 7.) Reichenberg: Anstalt für Heimatforschung.

Blancquaert, E. 1950. *Practische uitspraakleer van de Nederlandse taal.* Antwerp: De Sikkel.

Born, Ekkehardt. 1938. *Die Mundart in Darmstadt und in seinem Umland.* (Fränkische Forschungen, 12.) Erlangen: Palm & Enke.

Bree, Cor van. 1977. *Leerboek voor de historische grammatica van het Nederlands.* Groningen: Wolters-Nordhoff.

Chapelle, C.E.L. 1854. *Relation d'un voyage en France.* Edited by Jean-Baptiste Tenant de Latour. Paris: P. Jannet.

Coetsem, Frans van. forthcoming. *Loan Phonology and the Two Transfer Types in Language Contact.*

Corell, Hans. 1936. *Studien zur Dialektgeographie der ehemaligen Grafschaft Ziegenhain und benachbarter Gebietsteile.* (Deutsche Dialektgeographie, 7.75-215.) Marburg: Elwert.

Dauzat, Albert. 1930. *Histoire de la langue française.* Paris: Payot.

Donaldson, B.C. 1983. *Dutch: A Linguistic History of Holland and Belgium.* Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff.

Essen, Otto von. 1964. *Kirchwerder bei Hamburg.* (Lautbibliothek der deutschen Mundarten, 33-34.) Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht.

Goosens, Jan. 1977. *Inleiding tot de Nederlandse dialectologie.* Groningen: Wolters-Nordhoff.

Howell, Robert B. 1987. Tracing the origin of uvular *r* in Germanic. *Folia Linguistica Historica* VII/2.

Howell, Robert B. 1985. On the origin of uvular *r* in Germanic. *Germanic Linguistics.*

Edited by Jan Terje Faarlund. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club. 1-9.

Kranzmeyer, Eberhard. 1956. *Historische Lautgeographie des gesamtbairischen Dialektraumes.* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.) Vienna: Böhlhaus Nachf.

Kroh, Wilhelm. 1915. *Beiträge zur nassauischen Dialektgeographie.* (Deutsche Dialektgeographie, 4.65-381.) Marburg: Elwert.

Lafeber, A.P.M. 1967. *Het dialect van Gouda.* Gouda: Oudheidkundige Kring "De Goude".

Lancaster, H. Carrington. 1934. The beginnings of French uvular R. *Modern Language Notes* 49:243-248.

Lass, Roger. 1983. Velar /r/ and the history of English. *Current topics in English historical linguistics.* Odense: Odense University Press. 67-94.

Littré, Émile. 1877. *Dictionaire de la langue française.* Paris: Hachette. vol. 10.

Loey, A. van. 1970. *Schönfeld's historische grammatica van het Nederlands.* Zutphen: W.J. Thieme & Cie. 8th printing.

Loey, A. van. 1976. *Middelnederlandse Spraakkunst. 2. Klankleer.* Zutphen: W.J.Thieme. 7th ed.

Martin, Roland. 1922. *Untersuchungen zur rhein-moselfränkischen Dialektgrenze.* (Deutsche Dialektgeographie, 11a.) Marburg: Elwert.

Mees, Inger and Beverly Collins. 1982. A phonetic description of the consonant system of Standard Dutch. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 12/1:2-12.

Moulton, William G. 1952. Jakob Böhme's uvular R. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 51:83-89.

Muller, J.W. & Kluyver, A. 1902. *Woordenboek der Nederlandse taal.* Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff. vol. 3.

Obernberger, Alfred. 1964. *Die Mundarten der siebenbürgischen Ländler.* (Deutsche Dialektgeographie, 67.) Marburg: Elwert.

Payen, Nicole Rousseau. 1979. *La situation linguistique de Hilbesheim.* Bern: Peter Lang.

Penzl, Herbert. 1961. Old High German <r> and its phonetic identification. *Language* 37:488-496.

Runge, Richard. 1973. The phonetic realization of Proto-Germanic <r>. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 87:228-247.

Runge, Richard. 1974. *Proto-Germanic r* . (Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 115) Göppingen: Alfred Kümmerle.

Salverda de Grave, J.J. 1926. L'enseignement du français dans une université étrangère. *Études françaises* 10:3-24.

Sjöstedt, Gösta. 1936. *Studier över r-luden i sydskandinavoska mål.* (Skrifter utg. genom Landsmålsarkivet i Lund, 4.) Lund: Blom.

Trautmann, Moritz. 1880. Besprechungen einiger Schulbücher nebst Bemerkungen über die R-Laute. *Anglia* 3:204-222.

Ulbrich, Horst. 1972. *Instrumentalphonetisch-auditive R-Untersuchungen im Deutschen.* (Schriften zur Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung, 13.) Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Vooys, C.G.N. de. 1952. *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse taal.* Antwerp: De Sikkel.

Weijnen, A. 1966. Nederlandse Dialectkunde. Assen: Van Gorcum & Co.

Weinhold, Karl W. 1867. *Bairische Grammatik.* Berlin: Dümmler.

Wollock, J. 1983. Views on the decline of apical R in Europe: Historical study. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 3:185-238.

Zhirmunskii, Viktor M. 1962. *Deutsche Mundartkunde.* (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für deutsche Sprache und Literatur, 25.) Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Zwaardemaker, E. and L.P.H. Eijkman. 1928. *Leerboek der phonetiek.* Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn.