The status of grammatical categories, also addressed in usage statistical tendency in language use rather than as an invariant coding. We may also say that language use displays statistical tendencies, but hardly ever categorial distinctions. This poses theoretical problems for the traditional grammatical descriptions, generative as well as functionalist, notwithstanding adjustments along the lines of prototype theory (Lakoff 1987; Langacker 1987).

This paper presents the results of a study of word order in subordinate clauses in contemporary spoken Danish. Modern Danish (as well the other mainland Scandinavian languages Swedish and Norwegian) distinguishes between two different word orders. The so-called main clause word order is characterized by the fact that sentence adverbials and negations are placed after the finite verb (V2 word order):

han kommer ikke i morgen
he comes not tomorrow

"he doesn’t come tomorrow"

In contrast, the so-called subordinate clause word order always has the subject of the clause in the first position, and sentence adverbials are placed between the subject and the finite verb (V3 word order):

han sagde at han ikke kommer i morgen
he said that he not comes tomorrow

"he said that he won’t come tomorrow"

Under different headings, this has been the subject of numerous theoretically as well as empirically oriented studies. One question regards the traditional connection of word order and syntactic function as main or subordinate clause, another the semantic inconsistency between so-called main clause phenomena (typically, V2 word order and factivity (Hooper and Thompson 1973; Green 1976; Vikner 1995; Gregersen and Pedersen 2000; Heltoft 2005; Christensen 2007; Heycock 2007; Simons 2007; Wiklund, Bentzen et al. 2009; Bentzen 2010; Heycock 2010).

The results show that V2 word order in subordinate clauses is much more frequent than commonly assumed (Jensen Forth.). Furthermore, they substantiate the hypothesis that V2 word order is associated with foreground or main point of utterance, but notably, only if we accept it as a statistical tendency in language use rather than as an invariant coding. This raises the question of the status of grammatical categories, also addressed in usage-based models such as exemplar theory (Pierrehumbert 2001; Bybee 2006). We will discuss whether categorical descriptions may be compatible with usage- and exemplar-based theories, and thus may be applied to “fuzzy” data such as these. In continuation of this, we consider the implications for sociolinguistic methodology, being dependent on the notion of semantic equivalence (Weiner and Labov 1983; Lavendera 1996).
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DO-support (?) in Dutch standard and non-standard adult and child speech
Leone Cornips
Dept. of Language Variation
Meertens Institute/Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences

In this talk, several monolingual and bilingual child and adult speech samples will be compared that reveal to employ DO-support in Dutch standard and non-standard varieties i.e. *gaan*+inf ‘go’ and *doen*+inf ‘do’. Generally, it is claimed that children and adults use this structure differently; that’s to say, (i) they use DO-support with different temporal/aspectual readings and (ii) children, in contrast to standard Dutch speaking adults, use DO-support in derivational more complex clause-types with respect to verb movement. Further, in the literature it is argued that *gaan*+inf differs from *doen*+inf in that the former is always fully grammatical in spoken and written standard Dutch whereas this is not the case for *doen*+inf.

The aim of this talk is to compare child with adult use concerning DO-support with respect to the derivational complexity hypothesis (Blom & De Korte 2011). In addition, I’ll focus on the process of erasure (Irvine 2001) when considering the linguistic practices in publications about DO-support in Dutch. In particular, the aux+inf structure is considered a dummy one in child language and in so-called non-standard Dutch varieties whereas it is considered undoubtedly meaningful in standard Dutch. The consequences of this process are two-fold: (i) linguists ignore to pay attention to so-called non-standard uses of aux+inf in standard Dutch and/or (ii) they ignore aux+inf structures in child and regional/dialect Dutch in which DO cannot be analyzed as a dummy auxiliary. Both linguistic practices are very persistent. Finally, we will see that comparing spontaneous speech data with elicited, production data raise more issues about the various methods of data-collection.

Eliciting judgments on context dependent constructions
Elisabet Engdahl
Department of Swedish, University of Gothenburg

The Nordic syntactic judgment database (Lindstad et al. 2009) has been established through a collective effort in the ScanDiaSyn network. It contains judgments on several syntactic constructions of great interest to syntacticians. Among these constructions, quite a few are heavily context dependent in the sense that they are mainly used in situations where the speakers’ awareness of non-linguistic circumstances as well as their familiarity, or lack of familiarity, with referents in the example sentences may affect their judgments on word order, morphological form and/or prosody. In this talk I want to discuss some methodological and theoretical issues that arise in connection with the database. As examples of context dependent constructions, I will discuss the following, for which there is now judgment data available in the database. Additional Icelandic data comes from Angantýsson (2011).

Embedded topicalization:

(1) Han sa att den sången kunde han inte sjunga vid bröllopet.  [26]
   he said that that song could he not sing at the wedding

wh-extraction and topicalization from embedded clauses:

(2) a. Vem tror du att har rånat banken?  [39]
   who think you that has robbed the bank

   b. Per-Erik vet jag inte om han kommer.  [48]
   Per-Erik know I not if he has come

Based on my own experience from conducting interviews for the database, I will also talk about different ways of contextualising test utterances.
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Poor languages, rich languages, and the way to equality: How to analyze a poor tense system (Russian) in light of a rich tense system (Norwegian).

Pål Kristian Eriksen
NTNU

Languages vary in the extreme in terms of what grammatical categories they realize. Some languages have large numbers of tenses, aspects and moods, while the TAM registers of other languages are small; some languages express number and definiteness in their NPs, others are happily ignorant of these formal categories. When being questioned on how a language may do away with categories with which we are familiar in Western languages without being communicatively restricted the linguist’s classical response is that in languages without these categories one relies on context to obtain the same meanings. However, there is an implication in this idea which rarely seems to be addressed: If a grammatical category’s meaning could just as well be retrieved through contextual features and pragmatic notions, the grammatical categories themselves ought to be described by the linguist in the same pragmatic terms – i.e. less as semantic entities, but rather more as pragmatic entities.

In my talk I will take the example of the tense system of Norwegian and compare it to the much poorer tense system of Russian, where one single past tense corresponds to three in Norwegian. I will show how the distinction between the three Norwegian tenses may be described as pragmatic distinctions of different topic and focus settings, and consequently how the Russian past tense may be given a very simple semantic description, and through the same settings of topic and focus as in Norwegian obtain the readings of the Norwegian tenses.

The 2nd N'CLAV Grand Meeting
Gottskär, Sverige
August 22–25 2011
Margrét Guðmundsdóttir
University of Iceland
mgu@hi.is

Phonology and Syntax of Icelandic - A Real Time Project
The Project „Linguistic Change in Real Time in the Phonology and Syntax of Icelandic“ started in 2010, when it received a three year grant from The Icelandic Research Fund. The project seeks answers to the following theoretical questions:

- To what extent do adult speakers change their language?
- Are some aspects of language more susceptible to gradual change than others?

In the phonological part of the project some 200 speakers will be interviewed for the third time in about 65 years and some 400 for the second time in 25 years. Our main focus is on four phonological variables in Icelandic, but we collect information about all known geographically or sociolinguistically conditioned variables, many of which seem to be on their way out. The four variables that we concentrate on can be seen as pairs, two of them are found in North-Iceland (aspirated stops after long vowels; voiced sonorants before /p,t,k/) and two in the South-East (special monophthongal pronunciation, the so-called hv-pronunciation). Our hypothesis is that certain aspects of language may be more susceptible to gradual change in real time than others and the variables in question appear to be well suited to test this hypothesis. A small pilot study indicates, for instance, that moving from the relevant dialect area (the South-East) to Reykjavík does not affect both variables to the same extent. We suggest that this might be due to linguistic or structural differences between the variables rather than (just) sociolinguistic ones. This will be investigated in greater detail in the project.

In the syntactic part we will test a subset of speakers who were found to have acquired a syntactic innovation some 10 years ago (at the age of 16 years). It has been claimed that this innovation may disappear as speakers reach adulthood. This claim can now be tested and it will shed a new light on the nature of this interesting innovation.
The Norwegian language spoken in the American Midwest is interesting from several perspectives in addition to general linguistic ones: bilingualism, psycholinguistics (acquisition and attrition), sociolinguistics (language attitudes), and of course dialectology, which is our perspective here. Johannessen and Laake (to appear) looked at aspects of the lexicon and syntax and concluded, based on data from fieldwork done in 2010 plus data described in Haugen (1953) and Hjelde (1992) that although the Midwest is a vast area, it seems that the Norwegian language spoken there today can be viewed as one dialect. This supports the ideas in Haugen (1953), on the basis of similarities in the lexicon and syntax, and independently of the geographical background of the speakers’ ancestors.

In the present talk we will look at more aspects than just lexicon and syntax as we will expand our investigation to function words and morphology. During two field trips in 2010 we recorded conversations with around 80 informants in six states: Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, South Dakota and North Dakota. We will only look at a fraction of the informants in this talk.

Haugen (1953) claims that the development of the dialects in the Midwest could be characterised as a "gradual elimination of conspicuous forms", and that "many speakers have departed from their native speech in the general direction of the BL [Bokmål] without of course attaining the norms of the latter" (op.cit. p. 352). He says about the phonetic, morphological and lexical changes that they are "nearly always moving from a less to a more urban DN [Dano-Norwegian]" (op cit. p. 353). Bokmål and Dano-Norwegian are two terms used for the same written version of Norwegian used by the majority of the population in Norway. About the language that the Norwegian-American children learn to speak, he says: "they adopted as their own that dialect which was most generally used in the community, which often meant the dialect that was most close to DN [Dano-Norwegian]" (op. cit. p. 350). In the paper we will investigate whether it is the case that the dialect has become close to Bokmål Norwegian.

In addition, we will question a belief that we have met repeatedly both in Norway and in America, that the language of descendents of the old Norwegian emigration is old-fashioned and represents an older stage of Norwegian than that spoken in present-day Norway.


Johannessen, Janne Bondi and Signe Laake. (To appear). The Norwegian language spoken in the American Midwest is interesting from several perspectives in addition to general linguistic ones: bilingualism, psycholinguistics (acquisition and attrition), sociolinguistics (language attitudes), and of course dialectology, which is our perspective here. Johannessen and Laake (to appear) looked at aspects of the lexicon and syntax and concluded, based on data from fieldwork done in 2010 plus data described in Haugen (1953) and Hjelde (1992) that although the Midwest is a vast area, it seems that the Norwegian language spoken there today can be viewed as one dialect. This supports the ideas in Haugen (1953), on the basis of similarities in the lexicon and syntax, and independently of the geographical background of the speakers’ ancestors.

In the present talk we will look at more aspects than just lexicon and syntax as we will expand our investigation to function words and morphology. During two field trips in 2010 we recorded conversations with around 80 informants in six states: Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, South Dakota and North Dakota. We will only look at a fraction of the informants in this talk.

Haugen (1953) claims that the development of the dialects in the Midwest could be characterised as a "gradual elimination of conspicuous forms", and that "many speakers have departed from their native speech in the general direction of the BL [Bokmål] without of course attaining the norms of the latter" (op.cit. p. 352). He says about the phonetic, morphological and lexical changes that they are "nearly always moving from a less to a more urban DN [Dano-Norwegian]" (op cit. p. 353). Bokmål and Dano-Norwegian are two terms used for the same written version of Norwegian used by the majority of the population in Norway. About the language that the Norwegian-American children learn to speak, he says: "they adopted as their own that dialect which was most generally used in the community, which often meant the dialect that was most close to DN [Dano-Norwegian]" (op. cit. p. 350). In the paper we will investigate whether it is the case that the dialect has become close to Bokmål Norwegian.

In addition, we will question a belief that we have met repeatedly both in Norway and in America, that the language of descendents of the old Norwegian emigration is old-fashioned and represents an older stage of Norwegian than that spoken in present-day Norway.

Preproprial articles in Mainland Scandinavian

Preproprial articles are found in many Scandinavian dialects and these are primarily used with names and close family relations, see (1):

(1) menn ho Inger se kkje e så mykke te (Håberg 2010:90)
but she Inger see not I so much to
‘But I don’t see Inger much.’

The preproprial article displays, among other things, the following properties (Johannessen 2008:169-170): it can be inflected for case, it is unstressed, it has grammatical (i.e. not lexical) meaning, it occurs only with names, including family relations, and it is obligatory with the category it occurs with. Norwegian preproprial articles have only been marginally treated in the linguistic literature, one of the exceptions being Håberg (2010), where their status in three Norwegian dialects (Kvæfjord, Gausdal, and Voss) is described in detail.

In our talk, we aim to give a general outline of the preproprial article in Norwegian, Swedish and Danish, using two tools developed at the Text Laboratory (University of Oslo): Nordic Dialect Corpus and Nordic Syntactic Judgement Database under the ScanDiaSyn network umbrella. First, we show the distribution of the preproprial article in Mainland Scandinavian. Then we show additional data and discuss whether the preproprial article can precede all kinds of propra in the various dialects. The fact that this article is attested first in the 15th century in Norwegian (Håberg 2010:6) has been shown to decline recently in some Norwegian dialects (e.g. that of Oslo, Johannessen 2008b:73-74) shows that the phenomenon has not been a stable part of the linguistic system of Scandinavian languages. Finally, we propose a syntactic analysis of the construction, where we sketch the necessary conditions for a preproprial article to appear and we compare our findings to these of Delsing (2003).

References:

Predicative definite NPIs in Norwegian

Marti Julien
Centre for Languages and Literature, Lund University

In Norwegian, a weak quantifier or a scalar adjective with a positive value may combine with a definite noun and thereby form an attenuating NPI (Negative Polarity Item), as in the examples in (1):

\[(1)\]

a. Ho var ikkje store jente.
   she was not big-DEF girl-DEF
   ‘She was no big girl.’

b. Vi gikk ikkje lang tur.
   we walked not long-DEF trip-DEF
   ‘We did not walk a long distance.’

c. Dei sa ikkje mange ord.
   they said not many word-DEF.PL
   ‘They did not say many words.’

d. Ein rapport er venta om ikkje mange dag-ane.
   a report is expected in not many day-DEF.PL
   ‘A report is expected in not many days.’

As we see, these nominal phrases, which I call predicative definite NPIs, can be predicates, as in (1a), arguments, as in (1b) and (1c), or parts of adverbials, as in (1d). They are exceptional among Scandinavian nominal phrases, since they do not accept a prenominal definiteness marker despite their overall definiteness, and they are exceptional as attenuating NPIs, since they are templatic instead of being lexically defined.

The reason why predicative definite NPIs do not accept prenominal definiteness markers is arguably that they are structurally reduced. As a consequence, they are also defective in their ability to refer. Hence, they are semantically predicative, and in the terms of Giannakidou (1998) they are referentially dependent, which is a property that characterises many NPIs in general. In other words, their reduced structure causes the phrases to be NPIs, despite their definiteness.

Concerning their licensing properties, when three influential theories of NPI-licensing—Progovac (1994), van der Wouden (1997) and Giannakidou (1998)—are confronted with the NPIs discussed here, it appears that Giannakidou’s model more successfully than the others can capture the licensing of predicative definite NPIs, although some refinement is required even here.

Dialect leveling and regionalization in Åboland

Therese Leinonen, Society of Swedish literature in Finland

Åboland is a Swedish dialect region in the archipelago in south-western Finland, south-west from the city of Turku. The region comprises a large number of smaller and larger islands. Administratively the area forms a so-called economic region in Finland. Until 2009 the region was divided into eight municipalities; in 2009 these were merged into two municipalities: Väståboland and Kimitoön. The region has approximately 23,000 inhabitants, of which 64% are Swedish-speaking.

The last larger study of the dialects in Åboland was conducted on data collected in the first half of the 20th century (Zilliacus 1992). It is largely unknown how the dialects have developed in the latter half of the 20th century. The aim of the current project is to study the dialects in Åboland as spoken in the beginning of the 21st century. The data was collected in the project Spara det finlandssvenska talet ("Document the Finland-Swedish speech") at the Society of Swedish literature in Finland 2005–2008 (Ivars & Södergård 2007). The data comprises interviews with 41 speakers representing an older and a younger generation. The interviews are approximately one hour long, out of which 20 minutes have been transcribed and made part of a larger research data-base at the Society of Swedish literature in Finland. This transcribed spontaneous speech data is the main data for the study.

Although Åboland is considered one dialect region, the dialects in Åboland are very diverse. Scholars describing the traditional Finland-Swedish dialects have found that whereas the other Swedish provinces in Finland form clear dialect areas, the dialects of Åboland do not form one coherent dialect area, but dialects in western Åboland show many resemblances with the dialects in the province of Österbotten and dialects in eastern Åboland are very similar to the dialects in the province of Nyland. A few dialects in central Åboland are hard to group with any other Swedish dialects. The reason for the large dialect differences within Åboland is a medieval administrative border right through Åboland (Zilliacus 1992: 103-120). Even though this border is a historical one, it has affected the dialect situation up until the 20th century.

Central research questions of the current project are to establish to what extent the dialects have been leveled during the latter half of the 20th century, and whether newer administrative borders and school districts has led to regionalization of the dialects. Some preliminary results indicate large-scale leveling; many of the traditional phonological dialect features, as described by Zilliacus (1992), seem to almost have disappeared and are replaced by standard variants. At the same time, some other dialect features seem to be well-preserved and have the function of dialect markers. There is still strong evidence for the traditional east-west division of the dialects in the data.
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Where Voice meets Modality: the Agentive Get-Passive as a modal construction
Björn Lundquist (UiT; CASTL)

In mainland Scandinavian, the auxiliary få (‘get’) has at least three different uses: (1) a main verb selecting a DP complement with roughly the meaning “receive”, (2) a modal auxiliary selecting a bare infinitival complement with the main function of expressing permission, and (3) an auxiliary selecting a participial complement. In the third case, få seems to fall in the same macro-category as the auxiliaries ha (‘have’), vara (‘be’) and bli (‘become’, ‘be’), and it seems to be the eventive equivalent of ha, just like bli is the eventive equivalent of vara. Both få and have take a subject that is not the underlying object of the participle, in contrast to vara and bli. Taraldsen (2009) shows that there are at least two types of “get-passives” (i.e., få with a participial complement): the Adversity Passive (ADP), where the subject is interpreted as affected by the event (1-a), and the Agentive-Get Passive (AGP), where the subject is interpreted as an agent (1-b). The AGP cannot have an object intervening between få and the participle, and in that sense it behaves just like perfect and modal constructions, where objects cannot precede the non-finite main verb. Object placement is less strict in ADP’s (Norwegian examples from Taraldsen):

1. a. Storeulv fikk taket blåst av huset.
   ‘Zeke Wolf got the roof blown off the house.’
   b. Storeulv fikk endelig taket av huset.
   ‘Zeke Wolf finally got the roof blown off the house.’

Taraldsen (2009) points out that AGP’s require a sentient subject, but are not readily compatible with adverbs ascribing intentionality, like med flit/med vilje. In my talk I will argue that these two almost contradictory properties can be better understood if we treat the AGP as a modal construction, more specifically, an ability modal with an actuality entailment Bhatt (2000)(possibly provided by the perfectivity of the participle). As shown by Bhatt (2000), ability modals cross-linguistically change their meaning to ‘manage to’ once they appear in perfective aspect. In languages like Scandinavian and English, where aspect in general is not morphologically marked, the effect is less striking, but still, the ability modal kunna naturally gets a “manage to” interpretation in the past tense, as shown in (2-a). Importantly, in this construction, the same restriction on intentionality modals and animacy holds (2-b-c) (example from Swedish):

2. a. Efter en lång jakt kunde polisen slutligen fånga boven.
   ‘After a long chase could police finally catch culprit.’
   b. #De kunde med flit fånga boven.
   ‘They could with purpose catch culprit.’
   c. #Ljudet från trafikken kunde till slut innehålla barnen.
   ‘The sound from the street could finally contain the kids.’

I speculate that the animacy-restrictions and intentionality-restrictions can both be explained by the notion of ability. The idea is that, just as the other modals have a range of meanings, få has an ability reading on top of the permissive reading.

In the first part of the talk I will establish the AGP as a modal construction, and I will briefly lay out what we can learn about both modals and participles from this parallel. Secondly I will look at the differences within Mainland Scandinavian with respect to AGP’s. AGP’s exist in all Mainland Scandinavian varieties, but they are much less frequent in Swedish than Norwegian (and Danish, as far as I am aware) (see Larsson 2009 for discussion of get-passives in Swedish). As far as I am aware, no one has ever pointed out differences in semantic restrictions within the MLS varieties. However, looking at AGP’s as modal constructions, one cross-linguistic difference becomes apparent: in cases where no actuality entailments hold (in e.g. generic contexts), the AGP is still available in Norwegian (3-a), but not in Swedish, where kunna + infinitive has to be used instead:

3. a. NO: Man får kjøpt øl under middagen (i.e., it is possible to buy beer during the dinner)
   You/one can buy beer during the dinner
   b. SW: *Man får köpt öl under middagen (only: Man kan köpa öl under middagen)
   You/one can buy beer during the dinner (only: You/one can buy beer during the dinner)
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Something old, something new – Dialect contact in West Sweden
Jenny Nilsson, Institute for Language and Folklore, Göteborg

The project ‘Dialect leveling in West Sweden’ is concerned with today’s dialect situation in the western parts of Sweden and how the dialects in this area have changed since the 1950s. The project has investigated dialect use in nine villages and small towns located 50–100 kilometers outside Gothenburg, Sweden’s second largest city, and in this presentation some of the main results from the project are presented (see also Nilsson 2009, Svahn & Nilsson, to appear).

In total, 110 informants have been recorded in two different traditional dialect areas. Their realization of between 30 and 40 linguistic variables (depending on location) as standard, dialect or ‘new’ variants is analyzed. It turns out that today’s dialect situation in West Sweden is characterized by extensive inter- and intra-individual variation. For example, two informants with similar backgrounds, having lived within close proximity of one another for a whole life still has separate linguistic varieties; one might be a traditional dialect speaker and the other a representative of the ‘new’ (to this area) Gothenburg variety. As for the intra-individual variation it is apparent that most informants switch between dialect, standard and new variants within the same recording. In a way, this could be seen as a new ‘mixed’ variety or a new regiolectal variety (cf. Chambers & Trudgill 1986, Hinskens, Auer & Kerswill 2005).

In my presentation I will discuss in which ways new variants might change the linguistic system in an area and how we can theoretically treat this fact.
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Case allomorphy and variation in Danish and Swedish

Jeffrey K. Parrott

DGCSS, Københavns Universitet

Case variation inside of coordinate noun phrases (CoNPs) is relatively well studied in English (1), (2), (3); it is much less widely known that a virtually identical pattern of variation is attested in Danish (4) (all examples attested, see e.g. Parrott 2007, 2009):

(1) a. [Me and her] party!
   b. [My sister and her] don’t have any mutual friends.
   c. [Him and Gordon Brown] are communicating about that.

(2) a. And if our troops do lose, it’s Night of the Living Dead for [you and I].
   b. I sensed [she and I] as the same person, in that moment.
   c. [Him and I] were working at the time.

(3) a. This is starting to make [him and I] both feel really bad.
   b. It is perhaps surprising that [she and I] as the same person, in that moment.

(4) a. [hende og hendes bror] har selvfølgelig gået i de samme institutioner
   b. der er to år mellem [min bror og jeg]
   c. øh jamen [hann og jeg] vi kørte hjem i går
   d. En terapi med [hende og jeg] ville have været…

A developing theory attempts to account for these and related patterns of intra- and inter-individual case variation in (North) Germanic. The theory, which adapts Emonds (1986) within Distributed Morphology (DM, e.g. Embick and Noyer 2007, Embick 2010), analyzes “vestigial” pronominal case forms in English and Danish as an instance of syntactic-contextual allomorphy. Pronouns receive Subject Form (SF) exponence when they are the subject of a finite clause, and default Oblique Form (OF) exponence in all other environments. Therefore, a pronoun embedded inside of a larger structure—like coordination—is not itself a finite subject, and will be pronounced as an OF by default, e.g., (1), (3a), (4a, c). Prescriptively motivated, late-learned supplementary Vocabulary Items can moreover produce SFs that are adjacent to the coordinate head (i.e., and I or s/he and), regardless of the CoNP’s syntactic position, e.g., (2), (3b), (4b, d).

One advantage of this approach over previous treatments (e.g. Schütze 2001, Sobin 1997, et seq.) is the possibility of cross-linguistic predictions. Thus, variation in CoNPs is unattested (and impossible) in ‘transparent-case’ languages German, Icelandic, or Faroese (Thránisson et al. 2004, Thránisson 2007), as predicted. However, it is perhaps surprising that such variation is apparently quite limited, or completely unattested, among ‘vestigial-case’ Mainland Scandinavian varieties of Norwegian (Johannessen 1998, Hilton and Parrott 2009) and Swedish (Thránisson 2007).

This talk, therefore, will focus on the different patterns of case allomorphy and variation attested in Swedish and Danish. One very salient difference is that, unlike in Danish, SFs are clearly the default case allomorph in Swedish (and in fact SFs may variably occur as objects in one northern Swedish variety, Holmberg 1986). A proposed DM theory of Swedish case allomorphy attempts to explain a.) why SFs, and not OFs, are the default case form in Swedish, b.) why this makes case variation in CoNPs impossible for Swedish, but not Danish, and c.) how the mechanisms of case allomorphy in Swedish furthermore differ from those in ‘transparent-case’ languages.
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Where clefts and sluices meet:

The Wh+nå/då construction in the Rogaland dialects of Norwegian

Stig Rognes
University of Oslo

In this talk I will present new data illustrating a hitherto undescribed word order phenomenon, which is found only in the Rogaland dialects of Norwegian: Main clause non-V2 wh-questions in which either of the (always stressed) sentence adverbs nå 'now' or då 'then' immediately follows the wh-phrase, yielding V4 word order. An example with nå is given in (1), which is an excerpt from a conversation from the Nordic Dialect Corpus (Johannessen et al. 2009, henceforth NDC). The capitals indicate stress.

(1) A: Så har eg vêre vek å reist.
   ‘And I’ve been out traveling.’
   ‘And I’ve been out traveling.’
   ‘And I’ve been out traveling.’
   ‘And I’ve been out traveling.’
   ‘And I’ve been out traveling.’
B: Å? Kor NÅ du har vêre?
   ‘Where have you been now?’
   ‘Where have you been now?’
   ‘Where have you been now?’
   ‘Where have you been now?’
   ‘Where have you been now?’

      (NDC: Hjelmeland, Rogaland)

Speaker B’s question in (1) is what I—in lack of a catchier name—will refer to as “the Wh+nå/då construction”. In the existing literature on Norwegian non-V2 wh-questions it is assumed that no element may intervene between the wh-constituent and the subject (e.g. Westergaard and Vangsnes 2005, Westergaard 2009). This assumption, however, leaves the word order in (1B) unaccounted for. Importantly, the Wh+nå/då construction is never found with V-to-C movement. Subject-verb inversion causes unacceptability:

(2) *Kor NÅ har du vêre?
   where now have you been
   intended: ‘Where have you been now?’

The Wh+nå/då construction is found with all wh-words, with the notable exception of the wh-adverb korfor ‘why’, cf. (3) below. It is, however, found with the split variant ås ... for ‘what ... for’, also meaning ‘why’, cf. (4).

(3) *Korfor NÅ du e sur?
   why now you are grumpy
   intended: ‘Why are you grumpy now?’

(4) Ka nå du e sur for?
   what now you are grumpy for
   ‘Why are you grumpy now?’ / ‘What are you grumpy for now?’

A similar phenomenon is found in so-called sluicing constructions (Ross 1969) involving predication stranding, as shown in the following example from the NDC:

(5) A: Å det telet nå me ligg i det va ja bleit totalt bonka.
   and that tent-REL we lay in it was yes wholly totally bombed
   ‘And that tent we slept in, it was totally messed.’
B: Ka DÅ for?
   what then for
   ‘Why?’ / ‘What for, then?’

Preposition stranding under sluicing as in (5) is not limited to for ‘for’, but can be found with any other preposition as well, e.g. te ‘to’ as exemplified in (6).

(6) A: Nå ska eg på besøk te någen.
   now shall I on visit to someone
   ‘Now I’m going on a visit to someone.’
B: Kom då te?
   who then to
   ‘To whom (then)?’

Note that the word order in B’s reply in (6) is not readily acceptable in Standard Norwegian. According to Faarlund et al. (1997, p. 940), the preposition preferably precedes the wh-word in sluices like (6) (i.e. pied-piping resulting in a structure like Til heem da?, literally ‘to whom then?’).

In my talk I will give an analysis of the Wh+nå/då construction, and argue that it stems from an underlying it-clause. That is, (1B) is derived from the cleft construction in (7), with the copula and expletive elided.

(7) [vå] Kor NÅ [vå] du har vêre?
   [where] now have you been
   intended: ‘Where is it now you have been’

Where is it now you have been

By so doing I am able to straightforwardly account for the unusual distribution of the adverbs nå ‘now’ and då ‘then’ shown in (1B) and (4). The examples are both biclausal structures with elliptical clefts.

Considering the strong resemblance between the constructions presented above and sluicing phenomena in Frisian and dialectal Dutch as discussed by van Craenenbroeck Rut (2004), I will extend the ellipsis analysis to (7B) and (8D), and show that such sluices, too, can be analyzed as deriving from clefts.

---

1. Example (1) is taken from the message board of an online forum for gaming, and is written in dialect by a twenty year old male from the town of Sandnes in Rogaland county.
2. The conversation in example (6) is taken from the message board of a blog and is written in dialect by a ten year old boy (A) and thirteen year old girl (B), both from the municipality of Gystdal in Rogaland.
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The vernacular of Aarhus
By Inger Schoonderbeek Hansen

Although Aarhus is the second largest city in Denmark, the vernacular of Aarhus, 
Aarhusian, has, as it seems, had hardly any influence on the standardisation 
process of Danish. For centuries language change is solely influenced by varieties 
spoken in [the area of] Copenhagen, latest by spreading some of the lower social 
categorised features to all of Denmark. Since 2005 this has been demonstrated 
by studies carried out by the LANCHART Centre at the Copenhagen University, 
which focuses on longitudinal studies of Danish spoken language.

In other parts of Denmark projects with focus on the description of 
language variation and change are normally performed at a relatively less large 
scale, though not with less enthusiasm! In this paper I would like to present two 
investigations of the vernacular of Aarhus. The first one was based on an 
overview description of the vernacular as used in the 20th century, including 
some 100 students’ and teachers’ view on Aarhusian (i.e. Who does speak 
Aarhusian? What is characteristic about the Aarhus-variety?). The second project 
consists of two qualitative investigations of Aarhusian done by two of my 
students in the autumn of 2010. I shall elaborate on some details of the data 
collected, linguistic features as well as statements concerning the informants’ 
attitudes towards their own language use.
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Different methods, different results?
The methodology applied in an investigation can affect the results in various ways. Applying different 
methods in two studies of the same linguistic feature can thus yield different outcomes. This may 
seem confusing at first glance, but I want to show that on closer inspection the differences can often 
be interpreted in a coherent way. Together the studies can, in fact, yield a more nuanced picture of 
the linguistic situation than either of them alone could give. I will draw on the experience from the 
Icelandic „Variation in syntax”-project and some previous research where different methods have 
been applied – various elicitation tests on the one hand, and analysis of corpus material on the other – 
to show how these can lead to a somewhat different picture of the distribution of variants. The test 
case will be the so-called „dative sickness” in Icelandic, which has been extensively studied over the 
last 25 years.