

# **The Formation of Neologisms in a Lesser-used Language: The Case of Frisian**

**Hindrik Sijens and Hans Van de Velde**

Fryske Akademy

hsijens@fryske-akademy.nl, hvdvelde@fryske-akademy.nl

## **Abstract**

Frisian<sup>1</sup> is the language spoken in the Dutch Province of Friesland. Its approximately 455,000 speakers use it mainly for informal and oral communication. Dutch is the official language in the Netherlands, as it is in Friesland. With approximately 24 million speakers worldwide, Dutch is used in almost all areas of society. It is a widely supported standard language with a large written production.

Frisian has a limited tradition as a written language and consequently has a large number of lexical gaps. For many Dutch or international concepts, there are simply no Frisian equivalents. When it comes to new words, Frisian does not keep pace with Dutch either. Because of the limited use of Frisian and the omnipresence of Dutch, there are almost no spontaneously formed Frisian neologisms. Dutch neologisms often have a Frisian equivalent that is based on Dutch or no equivalent at all. Sometimes Dutch words are adopted literally, sometimes they are adapted in terms of pronunciation or replaced by a loan translation. Because Frisians live in a dominant Dutch context and have an excellent command of this language (as opposed to [written] Frisian), they easily adopt Dutch neologisms.

However, there is an unmistakable, partly ideologically driven, effort towards a certain standardization in written language, which creates a need for Frisian variants of neologisms. The asymmetrical bilingual situation outlined above also has an impact on the spontaneous creation of Frisian neologisms and their subsequent inclusion in dictionaries of Frisian.

---

<sup>1</sup> Following common practice, we use the term Frisian for West Frisian.

De Fryske Akademy is working on an extensive bilingual online Dutch-Frisian production dictionary (ONFW). This dictionary has a large, standardized, autonomous language as its source language, whereas the target language is small, dependent and far less standardized. The macrostructure of the contemporary *Algemeen Nederlands Woordenboek* (ANW) is the basis for that of the ONFW, which means that the ONFW mainly incorporates neologisms identified by the ANW. The Fryske Akademy also has at its disposal a corpus of bilingual news items (Dutch and Frisian). This is an interesting source, because news editors constantly have to think of Frisian equivalents for neologisms from mostly Dutch-language news.

In this paper we will discuss the possibilities there are for forming Frisian neologisms. We will also discuss the ideological responsibility of the lexicographer to form neologisms that have the greatest potential to be accepted by the language user, as only widely accepted neologisms contribute to the vitality of Frisian.

### **Keywords**

Frisian, Dutch, lesser used language, dominant language, language ideology, purification, standardization, bilingual dictionary

### **Friesland and the Frisian Language**

**Formal position of Frisian.** Friesland is a province in the northwest of the Netherlands, with approximately 650,000 inhabitants. Frisian is recognized as the second national language in the Netherlands. Frisian is a lesser-used language, both in the Netherlands and in Friesland, where Dutch is the dominant language. Historically, Frisian is the original language of the Province of Friesland. It is a West Germanic language more closely related to English than to Dutch. Because the Netherlands is a strongly centralist state, the national language Dutch has become dominant in almost every area and especially in the official domains (Klinkenberg et al. 2018, 6).

In Friesland, Dutch is the first language in the administrative, legal and cultural domains, and also in the media and education. In Friesland, Frisian is recognized as an official language next to Dutch, which means that the position of Frisian in the formal domains has been established and that Frisian can be used alongside Dutch. This formal position is guaranteed in the *Wet gebruik Friese taal*<sup>2</sup>. Frisian is also recognized under chapter III of the *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*. Language policy is a shared responsibility of the Dutch state and the province. This joint responsibility is periodically elaborated in the *Bestuursafpraak Friese taal en cultuur*<sup>3</sup>. This responsibility includes Frisian in education, administrative and judicial matters, media and culture, and economic and social life.

Frisian is a compulsory subject in primary education, and there are several trilingual schools (see Gorter and Van der Meer 2008 and Riemersma 2007 for more information on Frisian in education), but the goals for reading and writing are at a lower level than those for Dutch and English (Riemersma 2017). Frisian has been a compulsory subject in the first two years of secondary education since 1993, and it can also be chosen as an examination subject. Many schools limit the curriculum to the statutory minimum (Riemersma 2017). In addition, there are Frisian courses for adults.

**Use of Frisian.** Frisian is the only mother tongue for about 50% of the inhabitants of Friesland, while about 10% have both Frisian and Dutch as their first languages. Around 30% have Dutch as their mother tongue, and about 10% of the inhabitants of Friesland have

---

<sup>2</sup> *Wet gebruik Friese taal*, <https://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0034047/2014-01-01> (accessed March 13, 2019). [Law concerning the use of the Frisian language]

<sup>3</sup> *Bestjoersôfspraak Fryske taal en kultuer 2019-2023*, <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/convenanten/2018/11/30/bestjoersofspraak-fryske-taal-en-kultuer-2019-2023> (accessed March 13, 2019). [Administrative agreement on Frisian language and culture 2019-2023]

another (regional) language as their mother tongue (Klinkenberg et al. 2018, 38). In total, about 70% of the population can speak Frisian, while almost everyone can speak Dutch (Klinkenberg et al. 2018, 5, 54).

Because Dutch is the first language in the Netherlands, it has a dominant position in relation to the various regional languages and dialects. In the Netherlands, anyone with a mother tongue other than Dutch will learn Dutch at a young age and some children are raised bilingually from birth. Because everyone is proficient in Dutch, this language functions as a *lingua franca*, which means that in situations where monolingual Dutch speakers communicate with bilingual speakers, Dutch is chosen as the language of communication. This also happens in Friesland, where the general attitude among Frisians is that one should adapt to the language of the other; in practice, that would be Dutch most of the time (Klinkenberg et al. 2018, 17). In addition, it can be noted that the Frisian-speaking community, embedded as it is in the Dutch state, participates fully in Dutch, especially Dutch-language, culture.

**Frisian as a written language.** The dominance of Dutch has major consequences for the position and use of Frisian. Spoken Frisian is mainly used in informal situations and the written language plays an even smaller role, because there is no need to be able to write Frisian if everyone is fluent in Dutch. Moreover, due to a lack of sufficient education in Frisian, Frisians do not master their language very well. They have a limited vocabulary for certain domains, lack idiomatic expressions to express themselves well and are often uncertain about spelling (Duijff and Van der Kuip 2018, 198). 18% of Frisians indicate that they can write Frisian well, which is a remarkable increase compared to previous studies, which reported less than 5% for the last quarter of the twentieth century (Klinkenberg et al. 2018, 54). If Frisian is used as a written language, it is mainly in the cultural domain (fiction, drama, poetry, pop music), in the media (*Omrop Fryslân* and the Frisian-language news site *It*

*Nijs*), in public administration and jurisprudence, religion (Bible, hymns) and education (Duijff and Van der Kuip 2018, 197-198).

The relationship between Dutch and Frisian “has led to a growing divergence between the spoken language and the conservative, standardized written language, as a consequence of which the spoken language is not used by writers, and the written language is not understood well by all speakers” (Duijff and Van der Kuip 2018, 197). As a result, there is also asymmetric bilingualism in (the vast majority of) individual language users, with Frisian being subordinate to Dutch. This is in contrast to symmetrical bilingualism, where two languages are independent of each other (Van der Kuip and Visser 2018, 127-128).

The Frisian written language has developed since the beginning of the nineteenth century – the period of Romanticism. Since the second half of the nineteenth century, the language has been standardized. This standard allows for dialect differences and is laid down in dictionaries, grammars and textbooks (Duijff and Van der Kuip 2018, 197). In 2015, the standard was formalized by the Province of Friesland in a standard glossary (Taalweb 2015). Since 1879, there has also been an explicit spelling regulation that was simplified and adapted in 1945, 1980 and 2015.

Frisian appears relatively little in written form. When it is used in writing, it is not used in all domains, and it is more likely to be used in informal situations. Klinkenberg et al. (2018) show that only 10% of people over 50 use Frisian in official letters or e-mails, while adults under 50 use it even less (5%). In personal letters and e-mails we see a markedly higher use of Frisian, between 30 and 60%, with a systematically higher use among the elderly compared to young people. The increase in the number of people who say they have a fair command of written Frisian is to a large extent due to the use of Frisian on social media. Almost 95% of Frisian speakers under the age of 30 use Frisian in WhatsApp and text messages. Of the older generations up to the age of 65, more than 50% use Frisian on social media (Klinkenberg et

al. 2018, 99-100). Frisian is widely used among young people on social media, because it allows them to stay close to conversational speech (Jongbloed-Faber et al. 2016). The consequence of the limited use of Frisian is that many terms are not included in databases of contemporary Frisian. Missing terms in Frisian are often replaced by borrowings from Dutch (Sijens 2004).

The difference between spoken and written language is reflected in the differing influence of the dominant Dutch language. Frisian is under pressure from Dutch at all levels, and the Frisian lexicon is particularly sensitive to this pressure.

Interferences from Dutch frequently occur in spoken language, and when there is no Frisian term for a concept, a Dutch loan word is easily used, sometimes literally and sometimes adapted in terms of pronunciation and morphology. In written language, on the other hand, there is a purist tendency to exclude loan words from Dutch and to replace them with loan translations. An example of this is the word *gearkomste* 'meeting', which in Dutch is *vergadering*. In colloquial language, the word *fergadering*<sup>4</sup> is common. In written language, however, the more frequent purism *gearkomste* is used (Van der Kuip 2010; Duijff and Van der Kuip 2018, 203-204). This general trend has a specific effect on the formation of neologisms, as we will see in the remainder of this paper.

### **Neologisms in Frisian**

**Formation of neologisms.** For the purposes of this paper, we define the concept of neologism as a name for a new concept or new thing, as an addition to the language, in the form of a new word, a new meaning or a new expression (Sijens 2004, 259<sup>5</sup>). For a good understanding of the formation of Frisian neologisms, we will first give an overview of the way neologisms are formed, based on the classification of Algeo (1991):

---

<sup>4</sup> The spelling has been adapted.

<sup>5</sup> See for other definitions: Algeo 1991, 2 and Barnhart and Barnhart 1990.

1. Creation: a completely new word is invented. This process rarely occurs synchronously in Dutch and Frisian. When it occurs, it is often the result of a deliberate campaign, for example to replace a word that is no longer suitable. An example of this is *fломke* that was invented for *fagina* ('vagina'). Fantasy names for new products or companies can also be seen as creations.
2. Loan: loan words and loan translations. For example, Dutch words like *weblog* (loan word from English) and *wolkenkrabber* (loan translation from English 'sky scraper').
3. Combination: existing words are combined by compounding or by using morphemes to form new compounds or derivations. Example: *Klimaatspijbelaar* ('climate truant'), *verwildersen* ('to act in the same populist way as the Dutch right-wing politician Geert Wilders').
4. Shortening: parts of words are omitted; a new word is formed using the initial letters of word combinations: *cc* ('cc'), *ambu* (short for 'ambulance').
5. blending: words are shortened and combined into new words: *motel* ('motel' = motorists' hotel).
6. Shifting: the form of a word is changed, for example to form a euphemism (e.g. English 'pee'). This also includes change of meaning, metaphorical and metonymic developments, and change of word class.
7. Source unknown: the origin of a word is not known. The Dutch word *fiets* ('bicycle'), for example, does not yet have a satisfactory etymology.

Research by Algeo in 1991 into the origin of neologisms showed that most English (American) neologisms are formed by combination (62%) and shifting (17%). Only 3% of English neologisms are borrowed (Algeo 1991). In Dutch, neologisms are also mainly formed by combination, but the number of borrowings from other languages at the beginning of this

century, unlike in English, represented approximately 20% of the total number of neologisms (Sijens 2004, 274).<sup>6</sup>

**Method and data.** For the description and analysis of Frisian neologisms, we use Sijens (2004), who based himself on a manually compiled corpus of neologisms consisting of digital news sources from the period 2002-2004. We also use manually selected neologisms from a news corpus of *Omrop Fryslân* from the years 2012-2013<sup>7</sup>.

At 92%, the number of borrowings is much higher in Frisian (Sijens 2004, 275). This high percentage is confirmed by an inventory of neologisms in a more recent corpus of news texts from 2012-2013<sup>8</sup>. Of the neologisms found in this corpus, 95% were borrowed. English as a global language is therefore mainly a lending language. Dutch is in between, as an independent 'complete' cultural language: it mainly forms its own neologisms, but also has a considerable number of borrowings from English. Frisian as a minority language depends for its new words on the dominant Dutch and borrows almost all of its new words from that language.

No new creations were found in the Frisian neologisms that Sijens assembled in 2004, or in those from the news corpus 2012-2013. However, certain neologisms were formed by

---

<sup>6</sup> Figure based on a sample of material from the Instituut voor Nederlandse Lexicologie/Instituut voor de Nederlandse taal from 2002-2004.

<sup>7</sup> For this paper, we limit ourselves to the written language and to news corpora. To gain more insight into the formation of neologisms in Frisian, corpora with spoken Frisian should also be used, for example video blogs and radio and television recordings.

<sup>8</sup> This corpus consists of the news items that were made available on <https://www.omropfryslan.nl> in 2012 and 2013. The texts were downloaded using a web crawler, and the neologisms were manually excerpted.

combining, blending or clipping processes<sup>9</sup>. Most of these neologisms refer to concepts related to Friesland, especially Frisian culture. An example from the Frisian material from 2002-2004 is *túnþjut* ('garden toddler', a stone statue of a toddler peeking through the window). No Dutch equivalent of this word is known. In the news corpus 2012-2013 a few neologisms were found that are most likely Frisian: *brûsfûns* (Dutch *bruisfonds*, 'fund to support vibrant initiatives') and *poerbêst-produkt* (no Dutch equivalent found, 'very good-product', Frisian *poerbêst* is used to emphasize regional quality products).

**Borrowing.** By far the most Frisian neologisms are borrowed from Dutch. These are mainly new words that did not originate in an exclusively Frisian context, but in a Dutch or international context. The neologisms may be borrowed from English or another language besides Dutch. Frisian adopts these borrowings from English or other languages through Dutch, and therefore we consider these loans to be Dutch loans. We can categorize loans as follows: loan words, loan translations, semi-loan translations, 'incorrect' loan translations (Sijens 2004, 277-281).

**Loan words.** A loan word is a word taken from another language, adapted to the sound system, the spelling system or the morphological system. There are also loan words that are literally copied, without adaptation. These sometimes function as a kind of quotation, in which case they appear between quotation marks or italicized. Sometimes, they are also introduced with a qualification such as '*saneamd*' ('so-called'). Table 1 presents examples of loan words according to category of adaptation. The first column shows the borrowed and adapted Frisian form, the second column the original Dutch word. The third column gives the English gloss.

---

<sup>9</sup> Although most Frisian neologisms are borrowed from Dutch, new words may occasionally be borrowed directly from another language, for example from English. See Sijens 2007.

**Table 1***adaptation of the pronunciation:*

etys <b>ke</b> hacker [sk]	ethis <b>che</b> hacker [s]	‘ethical hacker’
feilichheids <b>synde</b> ks [i]	veiligheids <b>index</b> [ɪ]	‘safety index’

*spelling adaptation:*

etyske hacker	<b>ethische</b> hacker	‘ethical hacker’
komasûper	comazuiper	‘binge drinker’
ener <b>zj</b> neutraal	ener <b>gi</b> neutraal	‘energy-neutral’
feilichheids <b>synde</b> ks <sup>10</sup>	veiligheids <b>index</b>	‘safety index’
foedselbank	voedselbank	‘food bank’

*morphological adaptation:*

feilig <b>ens</b> synde	veilig <b>heids</b> index	‘safety index’
plante-ambulânse	plant <b>en</b> ambulance	‘plant ambulance’
24-oer <b>eso</b> arch	24-uurs <b>z</b> org	‘24-hour care’
whatsap <b>pe</b>	whatsap <b>pen</b>	‘to Whatsapp’
útprosedear <b>re</b>	uitgeprocede <b>erd</b>	‘exhausted of all legal procedures’

*literally copied from Dutch:*

ligtaks	ligtaks	‘lay tax’
voedselbank	voedselbank	‘food bank’

#### EXAMPLES OF LOAN WORDS ACCORDING TO ADAPTATION CATEGORY

**Loan translations from Dutch.** A loan translation does not borrow the form, but rather the meaning of a neologism. Table 2 includes examples of such loan translations.

---

<sup>10</sup> Note that /v/ in onset position is mostly pronounced as [f] in Netherlandic standard Dutch (Van de Velde et al. 1996), but in orthography this sound change is not reflected.

**Table 2**

snoadfoan	smartphone	‘smartphone’
tûke telefoan	smartphone	‘smartphone’
itensbank	voedselbank	‘food bank’
fiedselbank	voedselbank	‘food bank’
diereplysje	dierenpolitie	‘animal cop’
rinrobot	looprobot	‘walking robot’
stroffelstien	struikelsteen	‘stumbling stone’
boartersguodbank	speelgoedbank	‘toy bank’, cf ‘food bank’

#### EXAMPLES OF LOAN WORDS THAT BORROW MEANING RATHER THAN FORM

**Semi-loan translations.** Sometimes it is difficult to classify loans in one of these two categories, because the cognate (almost) literally corresponds to the Dutch form. The neologism *plante-ambulânse* ('plant ambulance'), for example, comes from the Dutch *plantenambulance*<sup>11</sup>. The question here is whether the Dutch form has been borrowed and adapted or whether the meaning has been borrowed and translated using existing Frisian words (namely *plant* and *ambulânse*).

Another example is *loknêst* (Dutch *loknest*, 'a nest to lure vermin'). This compound is also made up of elements that are almost identical in both languages. It can be classified as a loan word, but the process of loan translation would yield the same result here.

**'Incorrect' loan translations.** Making loan translations does not always lead to good results because word formation rules are not applied correctly or because a wrong word is chosen as a translation. An example of this is the loan translation of the Dutch neologism *DNA-verwantschapsonderzoek* ('DNA kinship analysis'). This word was included in Van Dale's

---

<sup>11</sup> It is possible that *plante-ambulânse* originated in Frisian, because the concept originated in Friesland. In that case, the Dutch is a borrowing from Frisian.

authoritative Dutch dictionary in 2013, but had already appeared in the press in 2007. In Friesland, this concept became topical when in 2012, following an unsolved and notorious murder in 1999, a large-scale DNA kinship analysis was conducted. The investigation and the arrest of the murderer received a lot of media attention, including from *Omrop Fryslân*, the Frisian regional broadcaster. For these news reports, the editors needed a Frisian translation of *DNA-verwantschapsonderzoek*. At first the loan translation *DNA-sibbenûndersyk* appeared, but then the editors used the loan word *DNA-ferwantskipûndersyk*.

The original Dutch compound is made up of three word forms: *DNA*, *verwantschap* and *onderzoek*. *DNA* is an international acronym and does not need to be adapted. The third part, *onderzoek*, is in Frisian *ûndersyk* ('analysis, research') and can be used without any problems in Frisian. The middle part causes problems when creating a loan translation. The Dutch word *verwantschap* is translated as *besibbens* and *sibskip*. Nouns with the suffix *-ens* cannot be used as the first part of a compound, so a loan translation with *besibbens* goes against morphological rules. Thus, from a linguistic point of view, *DNA-besibbensûndersyk* is not a correct loan translation. A loan translation with *sibskip* is morphologically possible: *DNA-sibskipsûndersyk*. However, the forms *besibbens* and *sibskip* are very infrequent in Frisian compared to the Dutchism *ferwantskip* and therefore the editors of *Omrop Fryslân* opted for the loan word *DNA-ferwantskipsûndersyk*. Journalists' fear of not being understood has prevailed here over efforts to introduce a 'correct' Frisian neologism.

### **Naturalization of Neologisms**

Given the high percentage of loans, we can conclude that Frisian neologisms are mainly or almost exclusively borrowed from Dutch. These loan words are often transparent and resemble the original Dutch words. Those who are less at home with written Frisian can therefore quickly recognize these forms and actually accept them as Frisian. These formations

are often the only forms occurring in Frisian. Examples are *etyske hacker* (Dutch: *ethische hacker* 'ethical hacker') and *enerzjyneutraal* (Dutch: *energieneutraal* 'energy-neutral').

Loan translations may contain words or parts of words that are less similar to Dutch or completely different from Dutch. In that case, they will be more difficult to recognize.

Consequently, it is less likely that they will be accepted or experienced as purisms.

Sometimes there are two borrowed forms, a loan word and a loan translation. An example of this is the loan word *smartphone* (Dutch *smartphone*, 'smartphone') which occurs in addition to the loan translations *snoadfoan* and *tûke telefoan*. The loan translation *snoadfoan* is a compound in which we also find clipping: *telefoan* ('telephone') is shortened to *foan*, which in turn corresponds to *phone* in the English *smartphone*. The form *tûke telefoan* is a combination of adjective and noun. The meaning of the elements *snoad* and *tûk* corresponds to English *smart*. The form *snoadfoan* is fairly common and is even more frequent (4.06 per million words) in an internet corpus of 3.3 million words than *smartphone* (1.52 per million words). *Snoadfoan* is also the lemma of the Wikipedia article on this type of phone. The fact that new compounds are also formed with *snoadfoan* indicates that this neologism is becoming a household word<sup>12</sup>. The fact that a form like *snoadfoan* is becoming more common is also connected with the wide distribution and extremely high use of smartphones. Finally, the form *tûke telefoan* is used sporadically on the internet and occurs once in the aforementioned internet corpus. This form is sometimes used as a stylistic alternative.

Another example of the coexistence of loan word and loan translation is Dutch *voedselbank*. Four Frisian forms of this have been found in the news corpus: *voedselbank*, *foedselbank*, *fiedselbank*, *itensbank*. The loan word *voedselbank* is an unadapted form that is frequently found on the *Omrop Fryslân* news site. The spelling of *foedselbank* has been

---

<sup>12</sup> In news texts on the internet, *snoadfoanbesit* 'possession of smartphones' and *snoadfoangebrûk* ('smartphone use') have been found as compounds.

changed, but the element *foedsel-* is a Dutch form. The forms with *fiedsel* and *itens* are semi-loan translations. *Voedssel* is translated with the Frisian purism *fiedsel* or with *iten*, which is a nominalized form of the verb *ite*, 'to eat'. This latter form is more in line with spoken Frisian, in which the form *iten* is customary for Dutch *voedssel*.

Loanwords are often obvious, transparent conversions from Dutch compounds to Frisian, which have a good chance of being included in the written language. Loan translations are more often consciously formed creations, as a way for the minority language to distance itself from the majority language. People who write Frisian want to give their language an identity of its own, so there is a tendency to use the written language as correctly and purely as possible, to distinguish it from the dominant Dutch by inventing forms that have something special and deviate from the Dutch form. The language community as a whole, which mainly uses Frisian as a spoken language, does not do this and supplements the language with often literally copied loan words; the community of Frisian writers then comes up with creative solutions such as *snoadfoan* and *tûke telefoan*. Sometimes this process is deliberately stimulated, for example by means of competitions to invent new Frisian words for Dutch neologisms<sup>13</sup>.

The question is whether it is possible to predict which form is more likely to become naturalized: the transparent loan word or the more deviant and sometimes puristic loan translation. In the smartphone example, it is striking that the Frisian form *snoadfoan* occurs more often than *smartphone*. This may be because this is a successful creative form that does not easily lead to misunderstandings and has a certain entertainment value. The *voedsselbank* example renders a diffuse image. The loan words *voedsselbank/foedsselbank*, which are borrowed quite literally, are the most frequent ones in the news corpus. They are not included

---

<sup>13</sup> For this purpose, various competitions were held in Friesland in the years 2010-2013. See Roper 2015.

in the Preferred Glossary because they are Dutch and there are Frisian alternatives available. The semi-loan translation *itensbank* is also frequent in the corpus; the more puristic *fiedselbank* is used less. Roper (2015, 342-343) doubts the success of deliberately created neologisms. The original loan words are often already present in the language and well established.

To provide a good answer to the question of naturalization, we need to have access to a more balanced and more extensive corpus of contemporary Frisian.

### **Neologisms in the Dictionary**

On the basis of various criteria, monolingual descriptive dictionaries at a certain point in time include neologisms. These dictionaries provide a representative picture of the language at a given moment, which also includes the renewal and expansion of the language. Regularly updated editions of printed dictionaries can be published and online dictionaries can record new words almost in real time. However, due to a lack of financial resources, it is often not possible for minority languages to update dictionaries and regularly publish new (printed) editions. For example, the most recent monolingual dictionary of Frisian was published in 2008 and it is impossible to foresee when a new or updated (online) version will be published. For the time being, therefore, Frisian will not have a new or updated monolingual dictionary containing the vocabulary supplemented with neologisms. The digital age makes it easier for lesser-used languages to create dictionaries with few resources and, very importantly, to update them. At this moment, work is being done on a new *Online Dutch-Frisian dictionary (ONFW)*. The *ONFW* is a bilingual active production dictionary primarily intended for Dutch-speakers and Frisians who want to write Frisian<sup>14</sup>. Through its microstructure, the dictionary can also be used as a passive dictionary.

---

<sup>14</sup> For a detailed description and characterization of the *ONFW*, see Duijff and Van der Kuip 2018.

The macrostructure of the *ONFW* will have about 70,000 lemmata upon completion and it is formed by a selection from the *Algemeen Nederlands Woordenboek (ANW)*, which is an online, corpus-based, scholarly dictionary of contemporary standard Dutch in the Netherlands and in Flanders, describing the Dutch vocabulary from 1970 onwards (Schoonheim and Tempelaars 2010, 718).

Because of its contemporary character, the *ANW* contains many neologisms, a number of which will also be included in the *ONFW* with their Frisian equivalents. Providing Frisian translations is not always easy, because Frisian (as we have seen) sometimes does not have a translation available yet. Because of the asymmetrical bilingualism mentioned above, the task of the Frisian lexicographer of the *ONFW* differs from that of, for example, a lexicographer of a bilingual English-Dutch dictionary. The latter will have much more recourse to corpora and existing equivalents, while the former, due to a lack of corpora and lexical gaps, will more often have to produce their own equivalents. In that case, the lexicographer will have to opt for a loan word or loan translation. Loan words may then be Dutchisms that are not adapted to Frisian, or words that are formed in accordance with Frisian spelling, pronunciation and morphology. Making a loan translation requires more creativity. The lexicographer might opt for a purist form that is distant from Dutch. The question, however, is whether it is the task of the lexicographer to preserve the language and keep it ‘pure’. After all, a translation dictionary is above all a practical tool; language planning by promoting purisms is not its primary objective. Nevertheless, a dictionary can play a role in the planning and preservation of (endangered) minority languages<sup>15</sup>.

A dictionary is often seen by its users as an authority on language, which means that the equivalents that are included are considered good and ready for use. The *ONFW* can

---

<sup>15</sup> For the role of dictionaries in preserving and furthering minority languages, see Duijff and Van der Kuip 2018, 203-204.

therefore, in addition to loan words similar to Dutch, also opt for good Frisian forms and purisms, because the user expects this. When designing the *ONFW*, it was assumed that the user would have a positive attitude towards Frisian, because the average Frisian writer aims to use the language correctly and will therefore try to avoid loan words that are similar to Dutch (Sijens 2004, 279, Duijff and Van der Kuip 2018, 204). The lexicographer must therefore offer correct equivalents, while ensuring that they are recognizable and have the potential to be included in the language. The editor must remain realistic and be careful not to form purist equivalents that are alienating and sometimes even ridiculous because of their deliberately constructed form.

From a descriptive point of view, the lexicographer can adapt to the reality of Dutch influence on Frisian and choose Dutch-looking, transparent loan words. On the other hand, they can work prescriptively and offer purist loan translations as equivalents. Given the linguistic reality in Friesland, a compromise between description and prescription<sup>16</sup> is more likely here. “Users of the dictionary can then decide for themselves whether to use a Frisian colloquial language in which Dutch is clearly recognizable, or a Frisian language that is mostly based on indigenous words and constructions” (Duijff and Van der Kuip 2018, 204).

To help users make this choice, labels are used in the *ONFW*. This means that for the three possible translations of *smartphone*, the loan word *smartphone* and the frequently used loan translation *snoadfoan* are unmarked and can therefore always be used as translations. The phrase *tûke telefoan* is labelled 'purism' and 'less used'. In the case of the lemma *voedselbank*, the Dutch loan words *voedselbank* and *foedselbank* are not included. The accepted loan translation *itensbank* is given as an unmarked equivalent; the loan translation *fiedselbank* is included as a purism.

---

<sup>16</sup> See Bergenholtz and Gouws 2010.

## **Concluding Remarks**

In this paper, we have shown that Frisian neologisms are mainly borrowed from Dutch. The reason for this is that Dutch has long been both the socially dominant language in Friesland and the dominant language of almost all Frisian-Dutch bilingual adults. The neologisms formed by borrowing are loan words and loan translations. The loan words are mostly transparent compounds that resemble Dutch. Loan translations differ more from Dutch. Because the spoken and written languages have grown apart, acceptance of deviating loan translations is not self-evident. When providing translations in a bilingual dictionary, the editor must be aware of this.

Frisian can be characterized as a weak, lesser-used, but vital language. To keep it vital, it is crucial that it is actively used by large groups of users, both as a spoken and as a written language. The dictionary is a tool to further the use of Frisian. It should provide the user with adequate translations of neologisms and words that have not yet been used in written language. Since language is the property of the community, efforts should be made to ensure that the community is involved in the dictionary. Users can be approached to make suggestions for equivalents<sup>17</sup>. A comment function (mailbox) can also be included in the web-interface. The involvement of the user will make the acceptance of the standard given in the dictionary easier.

## **References**

Algeo, John. 1991. *Fifty Years among the New Words: A Dictionary of Neologisms 1941-1991* (Centennial Series of the American Dialect Society). New York: Cambridge University Press.

---

<sup>17</sup> For user involvement in the compilation of dictionaries, see Duijff and Van der Kuip 2018, 206-207 and the literature cited there.

Barnhart, Robert and Clarence Barnhart. 'The Dictionary of Neologisms', in: F.J. Hausman, O. Reichman, H.E. Wiegand, L. Zgusta, Wörterbücher Dictionaires / Dictionnaires. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Lexikographie, An international Encyclopedia of Lexicography, Encyclopédie internationale de lexicographie. Dl. 2. Berlin-New York 1990, pp. 1159-1166

Bergenholtz, Henning and Rufus Gouws. 2010. A Functional Approach to the Choice between Descriptive, Prescriptive and Proscriptive Lexicography. *Lexikos* 20: 26-51.

Den Boon, C.A. & R. Hendrickx (eds.). Dikke Van Dale Online 2015 t/m 2017. Utrecht: Van Dale Uitgevers. <https://www.vandale.nl/> (accessed March 15, 2019).

Duijff, Pieter and Frits Van der Kuip. 2018. Lexicography in a Minority Language: A Multifunctional Online Dutch-Frisian Dictionary. *International Journal of Lexicography* 31.2: 196-213.

Dykstra, Anne, Pieter Duijff, Frits Van der Kuip and Hindrik Sijens (eds). 2015. *Taalweb*. Leeuwarden: Fryske Akademy. <https://taalweb.frl> (accessed March 15, 2019).

Gorter, Durk and Cor van der Meer. 2008. Developments in bilingual Frisian-Dutch education in Friesland. In Cenoz, Jasone and Durk Gorter (eds.), *Multilingualism and Minority Languages, AILA Review* 21: 87-103.

Haider, Horst. 2001. *Handbuch des Friesischen/Handbook of Frisian Studies*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag and Jonkman

Jongbloed-Faber, Lysbeth, Hans Van de Velde, Cor van der Meer and Edwin Klinkenberg. 2016. Language Use of Frisian Bilingual Teenagers on Social Media. *Treballs de Sociolingüística Catalana* 26: 27-54. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2436/20.2504.01.107> (accessed March 21, 2019).

Klinkenberg, Edwin, Nika Stefan and Reitze J. Jonkman. 2018. *Taal yn Fryslân. De folgjende generaasje*. Ljouwert: Fryske Akademy. [Language in Friesland. The next generation].

*Online Nederlands-Fries Woordenboek*. Leeuwarden: Fryske Akademy. To be published.  
[Online Dutch-Frisian Dictionary].

Riemersma, Alex. (2007). *Frisian. The Frisian language in education in the Netherlands*. 4<sup>th</sup> edition, Mercator European Research Centre on Multilingualism and Language Learning.

Riemersma, Alex. 2017. *General introduction Frisian in Education. Overview and developments since 2012*. <https://dingtiid.frl/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/General-Introduction-Education.pdf> (accessed March 21, 2019).

Roper, Jonathan. 2015. Crowdsourcing Nativisms. In Brand, Hanno, Eric Hoekstra, Janneke Spoelstra and Hans Van de Velde, *Philologia Frisica Anno 2014*. Ljouwert: Afûk/Fryske Akademy.

Reitze J. and Arjen Versloot. 2018. *The story of Frisian in multilingual Friesland*.

Leeuwarden: Afûk

Schoonheim, T. (ed. in chief). *Algemeen Nederlands Woordenboek*. Leiden: Instituut voor de Nederlandse Taal. <http://anw.ivdnt.org> (accessed March 15, 2019). [General Dutch Dictionary] (ANW)

Schoonheim, Tanneke and Rob Tempelaars. 2010. Dutch Lexicography in Progress: the Algemeen Nederlands Woordenboek (ANW). In Dykstra, Anne , and Tanneke Schoonheim (eds), *Proceedings of the XIV Euralex International Congress 718-725*. Ljouwert: Fryske Akademy/Afûk.

Sijens, Hindrik. 2004. Neologismen yn it Frysk – ‘Wat wy net hawwe dat liene wy’. *It Beaken* 66 (3-4): 256-298. [Neologisms in Frisian. ‘What we don’t Have, we Borrow’].

Sijens, Hindrik. 2007. ‘In Fryske detektive-roman, kin det, mei det, moat det?’ – Over de rol van het Nederlands bij het lenen van Engelse woorden in het Fries. *Neerlandica Extra Muros* 45(1): 33-48. [‘A Frisian detective novel, is it possible, is it allowed, is it desired?’ - About the role of Dutch in borrowing English words in Frisian].

Van der Kuip, Frits. 2010. Dictionaries and their influence on language purification in minority languages. The case of Frisian. In Dykstra, Anne and Tanneke Schoonheim (eds), *Proceedings of the XIV Euralex International Congress 1497-1504*. Ljouwert: Fryske Akademy/Afûk.

Van der Kuip, Frits and Willem Visser. 2018. Introduction. *International Journal of Lexicography* 31.2: 127-131.

Van de Velde, Hans, Marinel Gerritsen and Roeland van Hout (1996). The Devoicing of Fricatives in Standard Dutch. A real-time study based on radio recordings. *Language Variation and Change* 8 (2): 149-175.