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0. Introduction
This handsome volume offers a selection of papers on topics in Frisian linguistics written by Prof. Germ de Haan. It contains an Introduction by the editors, followed by De Haan’s articles. The articles are thematically ordered.

1. The editors’ Introduction
The editors have provided the volume with a brief and clear introduction about De Haan's scientific production and relevance to the field of Frisian linguistics (pp 1-6 + references 6-10). I mention the typo 'critisizes' on page 4, since it could have been avoided by running an automatic spell check.

1.1. Relevance to the field
The editors mention that De Haan held the chair of Frisian in the University of Groningen from 1991 until 2009. To this, it may be added that he was the dean of the Faculty of Letters from 2001 until 2009. In that capacity, he managed to keep the Frisian institute almost intact during a period of budget cuts, which tend to affect small studies more than big ones. The editors claim that De Haan played a central role in the field of Frisian linguistics. They do not argue the point very explicitly, doubtlessly because it would have been awkward to do so by comparing De Haan's role to the smaller part played in the field by other researchers of Frisian. Nevertheless, I believe that they are right about De Haan's central role, as is implicitly clear from his scientific production. The collection of articles brought together in this volume serves as an excellent overview of issues in the grammar of Frisian, involving such diverse disciplines as Old Frisian syntax, lexical phonology and (Dutch-Frisian) bilingualism. Furthermore, De Haan's strong point is that he is able to point out the relevance of specific Frisian facts for theoretical issues which are interesting to a larger audience. Thus, the book is not just suited for Frisian specialists but also for linguists in general who want to become acquainted with Frisian grammar.

1.2. Scientific production
The editors note that most of De Haan's publications fall into one of the following three categories:

- syntax
- sociolinguistics
- phonology

This is reflected in the ordering of the articles. Articles 3 through 10 deal with syntax, articles 11 through 15 deal with contact-induced changes in the grammar of Frisian, and articles 16 through 18 deal with phonology. The first two articles deal with issues of a different nature, and these are discussed in section 2 below.

2. De Haan's two articles of a more general nature
The book opens with two articles by De Haan of a more general nature:

Recent trends in Frisian linguistics
Why Old Frisian is really Middle Frisian
2.1. "Recent trends in Frisian linguistics"
This article is reprinted from the Handbook of Frisian Studies (Munske et al 2001). It presents an overview of the trends in Frisian linguistics since the Second World War. I discuss below some issues taken up in this article.

2.1.1. Generative grammar
De Haan can be very argumentative, and whenever he is, he can be somewhat unfair. In this article, he makes a distinction between traditional grammar and generative grammar, by referring to the latter as an explanatory linguistic paradigm. This suggests that before the advent of generative grammar, linguistics was neither theoretical nor explanatory. Referring to the work of Van der Meer, against whom he engaged in polemics more than once, he writes (p.15):

Not all Frisian phonologists took an explanatory theoretical point of view, see van der Meer (1976, 1977, 1979, 1985).

However, Van der Meer's articles provide a lot of insight in the phenomena which he discusses, and he does so mainly by using the terminology of traditional grammar. Conversely, there are many generative analyses which use the theory but which do not provide any insight. Thus there is no one-to-one relation between explanatory and non-explanatory, on the one hand, and generative and non-generative, on the other. Nevertheless, it is true that generative grammar provided a tremendous impetus to the study of language: many empirical phenomena were studied in more detail than ever before, uncovering a bewildering complexity of facts.

In retrospect, Van der Meer's scepticism about generative grammar foreshadows what is happening in the new millennium. The field of linguistics nowadays is increasingly critical of hardcore generative grammar, partly because its explanatory boasts are not as substantial as claimed (nor worked out in sufficient detail to be falsifiable), partly because its handling of data is methodologically incorrect. The increasing availability of corpora has given an enormous boost to data-analysis with the aid of statistical tools, and general distrust is reserved for sweeping statements about UG on the basis of 'intuitions' about sentences based on one speaker, who is not infrequently the author.¹ Thus, in a sense, Van der Meer was ahead of his time.

2.1.2. Dialect geographical research
De Haan claims that there has not been much dialect geographical research since World War II. This is not entirely correct. First, the Frisian Academy sent out inquiries to a number of informants throughout the province in the period 1978-1995. The results were presented on dialect maps with comments. This material has not been officially published, but researchers are free to visit the institute and use the manuscript or the data. It has been used for the WFT (Dictionary of the Frisian Language).² Second, a lot of dialect material on Frisian is part of the national inquiries sent out by the Meertens Institute between 1932 and the present day. Articles written on the basis of that material regularly refer to Frisian data.

2.1.3. Position of Frisian in schools
Plainly incomplete is the following claim made De Haan (21) about the position of Frisian in schools:

1 The decline of hardcore generative grammar can also be read off from the topics and from the bibliographies of the articles appearing every year in "Linguistics in The Netherlands", see Hoekstra (2011).

The position of Frisian in the curriculum of primary schools in Fryslân is such that in principle all children have been taught Frisian in addition to Dutch since 1980. The actual situation is, simplifying somewhat, as follows:

- schools are minimally obliged to teach one hour of Frisian per week
- there is no school inspection even on this ultra-light requirement
- many teachers are unqualified to teach Frisian

This hour of Frisian may be filled with language education or with singing or with watching a program in Frisian on television. About 100 out of the 500 schools, mainly in the countryside, devote more time to Frisian, and there are 40 schools participating in the trilingual school experiment. Given all this, it is somewhat misleading to claim that "in principle all children have been taught Frisian in addition to Dutch."

2.2. “Why Old Frisian is really Middle Frisian”

The second article of a more general nature deals with the issue of the periodisation of Frisian. Before De Haan’s article, there had already been some debate about the periodisation of Frisian and about the question whether Old Frisian is really “Old”, seeing that it is contemporaneous with Middle Dutch and Middle English. De Haan frames the discussion by excluding the periodisation of Scandinavian languages from the discussion so that the conclusion seems inescapable that Old Frisian should be considered to be Middle Frisian. He was criticized in Versloot (2005). Versloot (2005:259-260) pointed out that Old Frisian may be chronologically out of line with Old High German and Old English, but not with Old Swedish and Old Norwegian.

The more important question is whether Old Frisian is typologically more similar to Old or to Middle Germanic languages. Here, too, De Haan frames the discussion by concentrating on a comparison with Old High German and Old Saxon. Old High German is the most conservative member of the group of Old Germanic languages, so that even Old English would appear to be a Middle language compared with it, let alone Old Frisian. In fact, Versloot pointed out that some of De Haan’s typological criteria, when applied to Old English, would lead to the conclusion that it should be considered a Middle language. Versloot then goes on to show that the oldest Old Frisian material is typologically similar to Old English, whereas the later Old Frisian texts share many characteristics with Middle Germanic languages. Versloot chooses Old English as the point of comparison since, typologically speaking, it is the closest relative to Old Frisian (Nielsen 1981).

3. The syntactic articles (chapters 3 through 10)

De Haan’s syntactic articles do not suffer from the sort of weaknesses which I pointed out in his two articles of a more general nature. Quite the contrary: they are excellent. They are well written, well argued, and interesting to both the Frisian philologist and to the non-Frisian specialist in theoretical syntax. In fact, De Haan has a gift for pointing out the relevance of Frisian facts for the theory of grammar.

The first syntactic article is an overview article entitled “Syntax of Old Frisian”, showing De Haan at his best, synthesizing insights from the literature, pointing out the relevance of facts and making clear what the research agenda for Old Frisian syntax should be like. This article is reprinted from the *Handbook of Frisian Studies*, with one difference: glosses have been

---

3 De Haan's qualification "in principle" refers to the fact that the provincial authorities may grant schools dispensation from the obligation to teach Frisian. This applies to regions within the province such as De Stellingwerven, where the local dialect is not Frisian but a variety of Saxon with Frisian adstratum.
added to the Old Frisian examples. This is in itself a good thing, since many articles on Old Germanic languages are only understandable to specialists, as their authors stubbornly refuse to gloss their examples and thus share their expertise with others. It is a pity, therefore, that De Haan’s added glosses exhibit some mistakes. In some cases, particle-verb combinations have not been properly lined up, as in (6), where op ia has been lined with “give up”, instead of “up give”, which wrongly gives the suggestion that op means “give” and ia means “up”, see also (31, 33). In example (10), the pronoun se has not been glossed. In addition, by vrow toe has been lined up with “to (this) lady”, suggesting that toe means “lady”. Another unclear gloss is found in (18) where achma. ther on has been glossed as “must one thereon”. That gloss fails to express that achma is a contraction of the verb ach ‘ought’ and the impersonal pronoun ma ‘one’, and ther is incorrectly lined up with “one”, suggesting the one is the translation of the other. In (21), naet in schelma naet has been lined up with “one not” instead of with “not”. The worst gloss is in (26):
(26) sa ondwarde thi. [[ther] mat
so answerSUBJUNC the (one) REL
[him] to askie…
one it demand…
’so should he answer on whom it is claimed …’
It suggests that ther means “one”, but ther is actually the relative particle. The abbreviation for the relative particle has been lined up with mat. But mat is a contraction of the two pronouns ma “one” and t “it”. The gloss for to “to” is absent. It is unclear why a dot has been inserted after thi. Apparently, the faulty gloss is the result of shift and omission. Of course, specialists will see through this, but others will not. Glosses rely on the convention that the meaning of a word is represented by what is directly below it in the gloss; not adhering to this convention reduces the glosses’ informational value and is a source of potential misunderstanding. All this could have been avoided by applying the Leipzig gloss rules4 and checking up on the glosses.

However, this minor point should not detract us from the overall excellence of De Haan’s syntactic articles. Articles 4 through 10 deal with syntactic issues, without being overview articles, and they are listed below:
4. Finiteness and verb fronting
5. More is going on upstairs than downstairs: Embedded root phenomena in Frisian
6. The Imperativus-pro-Infinitivo
7. Two infinitives: ‘prate’ and ‘praten’
8. The verbal complex
9. The third construction
10. Complementizer agreement

Finiteness and verb fronting, (with Fred Weerman) scores the important point that verb movement in Germanic is not triggered by finiteness (or Tense), seeing that it applies in clauses in Frisian which are non-finite and not tensed. Instead, it is argued that AGR is what triggers verb-movement, on the basis of facts involving the Frisian Imperative-pro-Infinitive construction (IPI). According to Google Scholar, this is De Haan’s most quoted syntactic article, though it must be added that Google Scholar is still far from perfect since it does not distinguish, for example, between various authors having the same name.

More is going on upstairs than downstairs: Embedded root phenomena in Frisian analyses in

4 They can be found at the following address: http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php
great detail the empirical properties of embedded sentences introduced by the complementizer
dat ‘that’, which have the grammatical form of root sentences (abbreviated as ECV2, from
“Embedded, Complementiser, Verb-Second”). It is shown that such embedded clauses are
defective in their relation to the matrix clause in that they cannot participate in syntactic
processes such as preposing, bound variable binding, topicalisation and extraction of question
words and topics. Such clauses have a relation with their matrix clause which is not
syntactically but paratactically mediated, although we do not know what parataxis exactly is,
beyond being some sort of ‘syntax’ of discourse which ties utterances together into a coherent
whole. In addition, De Haan also briefly discusses embedded clauses without complementer
which have the appearance of root clauses and which are syntactically integrated into one
structure with their matrix predicate, thus allowing bound variable binding, extraction of
topics and question words and preposing. What complicates matters it that the combination of
matrix predicate + subject behaves or may behave as a parenthetical. He also points out the
presence of these clause types in German.

The article entitled The Imperativus-pro-Infinitivo deals with the question how the
subordinate IPI should be distinguished from the coordinate IPI. De Haan argues convincingly
that the IPI does not involve coordination, that both types of IPI are subordinate and that they
should be distinguished on the basis of the adjunct/argument asymmetry. The article argues
for a rather peculiar theory of control: according to De Haan, IPI's do not involve ungoverned
PRO but a variable bound from the SPEC of CP and licensed by the preposed verb. He does
so partly on the basis of the distinction between the following two sentences:

(38)  a. de plysje soe him opslute om my te beskermjen
    the police would him lock up in order to me protect
    'the police would lock him up in order to protect me'

   b. de plysje soe him opslute en beskermje my
    the police would him lock up and protect me
    'the police would lock him up and protect me'

Note incidentally that the gloss to (38a) incorrectly lines up the object pronoun my with
'order'. According to De Haan, the IPI in (38b) cannot have an arbitrary interpretation whereas
the infinitive introduced by om 'for' can. De Haan takes that to be a problem for a control
approach. However, it is possible to construct IPI's with an arbitrary interpretation:

(38') de plysje soe him opslute mei it doel en beskermje my
    the police would him lock up with the aim and protect me
    'the police would lock him up and protect me'

(38'') it plan en ferhúzje nei Ljouwert ta doocht net
    the plan and move to Ljouwert to be.ok not
    'the plan to move to Ljouwert is no good'

Thus, the possibilities for control depend in part on the properties of the higher structure in
which the controlled clause is embedded; there doesn't seem to be any need for a bound
variable analysis of the subject of IPI-clauses.

The article Two infinitives: ‘prate’ and ‘praten’ scores the important point that infinitives
ending in -e can behave externally as nominalisations while having the internal syntax of VPs.
This contrasts with infinitives in -en (gerunds), which have the internal syntax of NPs as far as
Case-assignment is concerned; the sentences are slightly adapted from De Haan's (36a) and
(40a):

(1) Nominalised infinitive in -e compatible with object NP, whereas the one in -en is not.
These facts suggest that the two nominalised infinitives differ mainly with respect to the ability to assign Case.

De Haan disagrees with Kalma about certain grammaticality judgments. In such cases, a corpus investigation may shed more light on the problem, since self-reports about grammaticality judgments are not always reliable: even linguists have been known to report grammaticality judgments which are at variance with their actual linguistic behaviour.

The eighth article, *The verbal complex*, deals with the intricacies of the Frisian and Dutch verb clusters. De Haan’s position is that clusters without to-infinitives are taken from the lexicon as base-generated complex verbs, whereas verbs preceded by *to* are extraposed. The arguments are involved but empirically convincing, although conceptually one may ask what prevents verb-raising to apply to bare infinitives if it is allowed for to-infinitives anyhow. Furthermore, the rule creating complex verbs in the lexicon is not specified: if it would be specified, in what way would it differ from a transformational analysis? Finally, dialects exhibit word orders in clusters without *te* which are equally complex as the Frisian word orders with *te*. Does that imply that those dialects have extraposition of bare verbs (that is, without *te*)?

The article also contains a section on passivisation which is somewhat unrelated to the article's main subject, that is, word order in the verbal cluster. That section contains interesting data on passive complex clusters involving verbs of causation and perception. Sometimes, the data warrant further inquiry, since it is not very likely that self-reporting such subtle data is reliable. Thus I doubt that the following judgments are correct, but that can only be decided by consulting corpora:

(66a) Der wurdt wol gauris yn 'e tün wurkjen sjoen
there is often in the garden work seen

(68b) *Hy lit it hûs troch my boud wurde
he lets the house by me built be

Furthermore, De Haan follows Zubizarreta in treating the causative verb as a syntactic affix without noting that this rather voids the meaning of the concept 'affix'. It raises the conceptual question why, thinking the other way around, causative affixes cannot be analysed as incorporated verbs. Put differently, De Haan/Zubizarreta takes the surface model for Italian data and grafts it as a deep structure model onto Frisian. Why can't the surface model for Frisian data be grafted as a deep structure onto Italian? Come to think of it, the notion affix only makes sense in PF. A 'syntactic affix' is an abomination, unless properly defined and providing interesting insight into otherwise obscure data. To end on a positive note, of course we want a model doing justice to both the Italian and Frisian data.

*The third construction* is a rather theoretical article. Empirically, it makes clear that IPP is not an intrinsic property of the third construction, since Frisian has the third construction without having IPP. The third construction is a mix of verb-raising and extraposition, in which verbal arguments may appear in the extraposed complement as well as to the left of the governing auxiliary verb. An example is provided below:

(1a) Dizze wedstriid *winne* wie slimmer as him ferlieze
this game win was worse than it lose

(1b) *Dizze wedstriid *winnen* wie slimmer as him ferlieze
this game win was worse than it lose

Furthermore, De Haan follows Zubizarreta in treating the causative verb as a syntactic affix without noting that this rather voids the meaning of the concept 'affix'. It raises the conceptual question why, thinking the other way around, causative affixes cannot be analysed as incorporated verbs. Put differently, De Haan/Zubizarreta takes the surface model for Italian data and grafts it as a deep structure model onto Frisian. Why can't the surface model for Frisian data be grafted as a deep structure onto Italian? Come to think of it, the notion affix only makes sense in PF. A 'syntactic affix' is an abomination, unless properly defined and providing interesting insight into otherwise obscure data. To end on a positive note, of course we want a model doing justice to both the Italian and Frisian data.

*The third construction* is a rather theoretical article. Empirically, it makes clear that IPP is not an intrinsic property of the third construction, since Frisian has the third construction without having IPP. The third construction is a mix of verb-raising and extraposition, in which verbal arguments may appear in the extraposed complement as well as to the left of the governing auxiliary verb. An example is provided below:
(1) Omdat er my miende dat forbiede te kinnen
because he me thought that forbid to be able

The indirect object of *forbide* 'forbid' occurs to the left of the auxiliary verb *miende* 'thought', whereas the direct object *dat* 'that' occurs to the right. This is reminiscent of Verb Projection Raising in Flemish dialects, except that those have it with modal auxiliaries as well. I noticed third constructions are already present in the work of Waling Dijkstra (19th century), so if it is an interference from Dutch, it must be an old one.

I note at this point that the articles have been reprinted without bibliography. The bibliographies have been merged and put at the end of the book. I find this a pity, because I remembered De Haan referred to Den Dikken in one of his articles, but I didn't remember in which. Had the bibliographies been present at the end of each article, I could simply have inspected these. Now I cannot find out in which article De Haan refers to Den Dikken, without having to re-read all the syntactic articles. On a more rational note, joining bibliographies destroys useful information; it destroys the handy overview of references which De Haan used for each individual article. So I would recommend against this practice. As for space considerations, it hardly saves any space. A few pages more or less in a book of 384 pages will be allowable.

The last syntactic article is “Complementizer agreement”. It argues convincingly that complementiser agreement is indeed complementizer agreement in the 2SG and that the relevant facts cannot be accounted for by a clitic analysis such as proposed by Van der Meer (1991).

4. Articles on language contact

Articles 11 through 15 deal with language contact, more specifically, with interference from Dutch in the grammar of Frisian. The titles of the articles are listed below:

11. Grammatical borrowing and language change: The dutchification of Frisian
12. Frisian language changes
13. Recent changes in the verbal complex of Frisian
14. Contact-induced changes in Modern West Frisian
15. On the (in-)stability of Frisian

*Grammatical borrowing and language change: The dutchification of Frisian*: this article presents two claims. With respect to morphology, it is argued that no endings are borrowed from Dutch in case Frisian *kafeeke* becomes *kafeetsje* on the analogy of Dutch *cafétje*. This change takes place after vowels. The change can be described internal to Frisian, since the suffix *–tsje* independently exists in Frisian: it just widens its scope. However, although De Haan hardly addresses the issue, it is undeniable that Frisian *–tsje* is widening its scope under the influence of Dutch, even though, as De Haan notes, we don’t know why Dutch manifests its influence in this particular morphological subdomain, and not in other domains where Frisian has *–ke*. Thus De Haan notes that *hûske* is not (yet) becoming *hûsje* on the analogy of Dutch *huisje*. To sum, De Haan is right in his criticism of those who, not being pure linguists, loosely talk about borrowing bound morphemes. Nevertheless, an expert linguist like De Haan may be expected not just to criticise non-specialists but also to provide some new insight into these phenomena: sharing daring or exploratory analyses entails that they become easy for others to criticise, and it involves a weakening of one’s position, argumentatively speaking, but it is an essential ingredient of working on the frontiers of knowledge.
The article also argues that the Frisian verb cluster not just borrows the Dutch order, seeing that Interference Frisian also testifies to word orders which are found neither in Frisian nor in Dutch. Here De Haan arrives again at a negative conclusion: there is no syntactic borrowing in the sense of borrowing the Dutch rules. However, I would say that what gets borrowed are the Dutch lexical specifications for word order, which the Frisian auxiliaries may make use of, alongside the originally Frisian specifications for word order. Thus, a Frisian auxiliary may either have its Frisian word order specification or the Dutch one. If one verb in a cluster chooses the Dutch specification, and another the Frisian one, then mixed orders are the result. This goes a long way towards explaining the wild variation in word order reported by Koeneman & Postma (2006). The correlation with IPP follows from the assumption that the verb’s syntactic specifications are borrowed as a whole, where frequency considerations play a role as well. This may provide support for a bifurcation between the specification of functional or syntactic characteristics and phonological form. Of course, this is a speculation, but speculation belong to science just as criticism does.

Frisian language changes is an interesting article. In it, De Haan discovers and analyses new data involving Interference Frisian from the inquiry of the Society for Dutch dialects (Stichting Nederlandse Dialecten). The focus is therefore on the data, not so much on the faults in other people’s analyses. De Haan shows that the degree of interference increases with every generation. Although he doesn’t provide statistics, most of the changes are significant per generation when checked with Fisher’s Exact Test. His data also indicate that the Dutch anaphor zich is absent in the oldest generation, and on the rise in every successive generation. The oldest generation consists of people born before 1916.

To this we may add the following observation: zich is also found in 18th century Frisian, for example in the work of the literary author Durk Lenige. This makes it clear that Dutch interference is not something belonging to the 20th century. As long as there have been bilingual Frisians, there has been Interference Frisian. The same applies to the Dutchism oait for ea ‘ever’ and noait for nea ‘never’. These entered the language around 1700, in the 18th century ea and nea were obsolete, but they were revived again in the written language by the adherents of the Frisian language movement. It is clear that the percentage of speakers of Interference Frisian has been on the rise in the 20th century. One may speculate that there have been fluctuations in the percentage of speakers of Interference Frisian, depending on socio-economic circumstances.

Recent changes in the verbal complex of Frisian discusses in more detail word order in the verbal cluster in Interference Frisian. It is argued that Interference Frisian involves a grammatical subsystem in its own right.

Contact-induced changes in Modern West Frisian presents an overview of the types of interference that take place in various domains of the grammar. De Haan follows Chomsky in assuming that new data, in language acquisition and language change, do not come with grammatical properties associated with them. Thus, Interference Frisian is not the result of Dutch grammar influencing Frisian grammar, but it is the result of raw Dutch data which are somehow being used as input to a newly constructed Frisian grammar, that is Interference Frisian. The Frisian data are apparently too low in frequency (either absolutely or relatively in comparison with Dutch) to be used by the language learners for the construction of a grammar.

of Standard Frisian. Thus Interference Frisian is the result of incomplete second language acquisition.

On the (in-)stability of Frisian is a devastating criticism of Gorter and Jonkman (1995), which presents a large-scale survey on the position of Frisian. Some quotes from De Haan’s article: “Notably missing from this list of interested parties [a list presented by Gorter and Jonkman] are scientists. Or maybe this really is not so notable at all, and the study has no scientific pretence whatsoever. … there is no scientific debate … TYF94 has delivered so little in spite of sizable investments … The study seems to have occurred in absolute isolation”. Although one may disagree about the way he phrased it, De Haan’s criticism is rational and valid. This is confirmed by the fact that Gorter and Jonkman never replied to De Haan’s criticism, as they would surely have done if they had disagreed.

5. Articles on phonology
Articles 16 through 18 deal with phonology, and their titles are listed below

16. Nasalization and lengthening
17. Monophthongs and syllable structure
18. A lexical theory of schwa-deletion

In these articles, De Haan argues for improvements on the phonological analysis of certain phenomena, generally taking Visser’s work as his starting point. Nasalization and lengthening argues that nasalisation and lengthening should be considered to be separate processes. Somewhat surprisingly, De Haan chooses to make use of a complicated theory according to which a schwa does not define a syllable but “an appendix to a syllable” (an idea from Kager and Zonneveld) in order to explain that lengthening may apply in nasalised vowels with primary stress such as finster and those without primary stress such as útfynst. Of course, this makes one wonder whether ‘being an appendix to a syllable’ is just a complicated metaphor, which replaces formalised restrictions following the logic of the chosen theory and framework. Put differently, this whole idea of appendices is conceptually unattractive.

Empirically, De Haan stresses that such lengthening occurs normally on nasalised vowels with primary stress, as is testified to by the contrast between provinsje (lengthened) and provinsjaal (not lengthened). However, it is obvious that primary stress is not what is at issue. Clearly, stress is at issue. Lengthening correlates strongly with stressed nasalised vowels, regardless of whether they are primarily or secondarily stressed. As far as I could see, this accounts for all the relevant examples which De Haan accounts for. Some exceptions, like Finsk (no lengthening), need to be treated by De Haan as exceptions as well. If this is correct, a much simpler analysis is called for.

Monophthongs and syllable structure argues for a phonotactic distinction between monophthongs: those which show a ‘length’ opposition (De Haan’s A-vowels) and those which do not (B-vowels). This is independent of phonetic length, and corresponds to the distinction in the Dutch vowel system between tense and lax vowels. The A and B vowels have different distributional properties: A-vowels must occur in open syllables whereas B-vowels must be followed by a consonant belonging to the same syllable. Furthermore, A-vowels can be followed by no more than one non-coronal consonant whereas B-vowels can be followed by two such consonants. Thus the distinction between these two vowel types parasitizes upon a distinction in the syllable’s consonantal skeleton. Perhaps it can even be viewed as a harmony process.
A lexical theory of schwa-deletion deals with the distribution of nasalised vowels and syllabic consonants. The discussion with Visser (1997) is somewhat inconclusive, as De Haan notes, because of differing judgments and different empirical coverage.

To sum up, this collection of selected articles by De Haan provides both the Frisian specialist and the interested linguist with excellent and well-written research in Frisian linguistics. The articles presuppose a background in generative grammar, but they are also understandable for non-generativists. The empirical data are always interesting, the theory challenging. This work is perhaps not a monumentum aere perennis, because nothing in science is, but it will certainly remain relevant and useful for many years to come.
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