

Introduction

Kristine Bentzen and Øystein Alexander Vangsnes
University of Tromsø

The papers in this volume of *Nordlyd* are written versions of presentations that were given at the *1st Grand Meeting for Scandinavian Dialect Syntax*. The meeting (see <http://uit.no/scandiasyn/leikanger>) was held in Leikanger, Norway, 24-28 August 2005, and in effect it constituted the culmination of almost three years of planning and fund raising for a collaborative pan-Scandinavian research effort to systematically map and investigate syntactic variation across the dialects of the Scandinavian language area (see the paper by Vangsnes below).

The meeting was the main activity in 2005 within the *Network for Scandinavian Dialect Syntax*, which is funded by the Nordic Research Board (NordForsk) in the period 2005-2007. Altogether fifty participants, mainly from the twelve groups in the network, took part in the meeting. The most important single purpose of the meeting was to discuss organizational issues pertaining to the Scandinavian dialect syntax project, and the first part of this volume contains five papers that present and discuss various projects.

The first paper in part I (Vangsnes) presents the Scandinavian dialect syntax project itself. The second paper (Sandøy) presents another recent collaborative project in Scandinavian linguistics, more specifically on modern import words in the languages of the Nordic countries. Since many of the challenges and opportunities were the same or similar for that project and for the Scandinavian dialect syntax project, the latter could benefit greatly from the experiences made within the former.

The following two papers also present projects which the Scandinavian project can learn from. The paper by Benincà and Poletto presents the atlas project for the syntax of northern Italian dialects, *Atlante Sintattico dell' Italia Settentrionale* (ASIS), which is the oldest running dialect syntax project in Europe, being initiated in the early 1990s. The paper by Barbiers and Bennis presents the Dutch dialect syntax atlas project, *Syntactische Atlas van de Nederlandse Dialecten* (SAND), which has produced both a published dialect syntax atlas for the Dutch language area and a dynamic database with the collected material. Both of the research groups behind these more advanced dialect syntax projects are part of the NordForsk network precisely so that their valuable experience can be directly accessible for the Scandinavian project.

The fifth paper in section I (Corver, van Koppen, Kranendonk, and Rigterink) presents a more specific project on dialectal variation in the Dutch DP. Within the SAND project one chose not to include noun phrase syntax, but this is currently being studied in the project *Diversity in Dutch DP Design* at the University of Utrecht. The project involves a postdoc project as well as two PhD projects, and the paper gives a general outline to the set-up of the project.

The sixth paper (Thráinsson, Angantýsson, Svavarsdóttir, Eythórsson, and Jónsson) presents the Icelandic sub-project of the Scandinavian dialect syntax project. The Icelanders were the first to gain funding for their part, first for a pilot study of methods for data collection and then for the Icelandic and Faroese subproject(s) proper. The paper presents both the pilot study and the plans for the ongoing main project.

The papers in part II of the volume are all regular linguistics papers in the sense that they discuss various grammatical phenomena which show variation across dialects and/or closely related languages: these papers were presented at a workshop for PhD students and young researchers which was organized on the first day of the meeting in Leikanger.

The paper by Bentzen discusses verb placement in embedded contexts in three varieties of Norwegian, Eastern Norwegian (EastN), Tromsø Northern Norwegian (TrNN), and Regional Northern Norwegian (ReNN). She shows that whereas all verbs have to follow all adverbs in embedded contexts in EastN, in the two northern dialects verbs may to varying degrees precede adverbs in these contexts. The variation is accounted for within a remnant movement approach, and related to various ways of checking selectional features.

Christensen in his paper discusses cross-linguistic variation with respect to the distribution of the infinitive marker in the Scandinavian languages. He argues that the base-position of the infinitive marker is the top-most head in the VP-domain in all the Scandinavian languages (as well as in English). Variation is accounted for by assuming that the infinitive marker undergoes head movement. In Danish, English, Norwegian, and Early Modern Danish, such movement is optional, and not feature-driven. In Faroese, Icelandic, and Swedish, on the other hand, movement is triggered by ϕ -feature checking on Fin° . In Icelandic and Swedish these ϕ -features are strong and induce obligatory $v^{\circ} \rightarrow \text{Fin}^{\circ}$ movement, whereas they are weak in Faroese and do not induce $v^{\circ} \rightarrow \text{Fin}^{\circ}$ movement.

The paper by De Vogelaer discusses Hawkins' generalization about the correlation between morphological expression of grammatical relations and freedom of word order. He argues that Dutch is problematic for Hawkins' generalization, as neither case nor word order can be used consistently to

INTRODUCTION

express the basic grammatical relations. Thus, he proposes a new typology, including verb agreement as an extra parameter. Furthermore, based on data from the Scandinavian languages and Afrikaans, De Vogelaer suggests that Hawkins' notion of 'grammatical word order' should be refined to concern the availability of the SVO order in all sentence types.

Hrafnbjargarson's paper discusses how to generate a lexicon of corresponding modal verbs in Scandinavian. Cognate modals often have different meanings in the various Scandinavian languages: *måtte* for instance means 'may' in Danish and 'must' in Norwegian. Thus one cannot always rely on morphology or phonology to find out which modals correspond to each other. Rather, Hrafnbjargarson illustrates how a parallel corpus, *The Sophie Treebank*, can be used to find out which modal verbs correspond to which in the various Scandinavian languages.

The paper by Penello is a contribution to the cartography of the CP projection. She investigates the cooccurrence of proclitic and enclitic subject clitics (2-Scl) and object clitics (2-Ocl) in main interrogatives in two Northern Italian dialects, Carmignano di Brenta (Carm) and Paduan. The two dialects vary with respect to the distribution of Scl and Ocl, Paduan displaying more restrictions than Carm. Based on her findings, Penello argues for further refinements of the structure in the CP domain. Moreover, she suggests that the activation of the clitic field in the CP domain runs along a rigorous implicational scale: first lower clitic heads (object clitics) are activated and then higher heads (dative clitic, etc.) are activated. This accounts for the variation found between the two dialects.

The paper by Polo aims at accounting for the wide range of structural options with respect to interrogative clauses allowed by contemporary Italian dialects. She discusses the dynamics of change and variation as they surface both synchronically and diachronically across a selected number of Eastern Veneto and other Northern Italian dialects. Polo argues that the analysis of the evolution of the Venetian dialect makes it possible to identify intermediate stages in the diachronic process. The various evolutionary stages are mirrored in the Modern Veneto dialects, suggesting that inter-dialectal variation is a by-product of the different parametric values languages activate in dependence on the position they occupy in the evolutionary continuum reconstructed.

The paper by Rosenkvist discusses the use of the South Swedish Apparent Cleft (SSAC) which he demonstrates is not a regular cleft construction. He finds two main variants of this south Swedish construction, one with and one without an adverbial expressing speaker attitude. Rosenkvist further suggests that the discourse function of the SSAC is to express information that is known to the speaker but not to the listener.

Equivalent constructions are found in Japanese and English. Thus, he points out that the SSAC offers an opportunity to study a possible cluster of syntactic constructions which seem to relate to a relatively narrow pragmatic domain.

In addition to the project presentations and the workshop for PhD students and young researchers there were two invited speakers at the Grand Meeting in Leikanger. Ann-Marie Ivars gave a lecture on nominal syntax in the dialects of southern Ostrobothnia in Finland and Peter Svenonius gave one on verb-particle alternation in the Scandinavian languages. Written versions of these presentations are not included in this volume. A version of Ivars' paper appeared in *Svenska Landsmål och svenskt folkliv 2005 (Swedish Dialects and Folk Traditions 2005)* with the title 'Sydösterbottnisk nominalfrassyntax'.

Another main objective at the meeting in Leikanger was to work on the list of potential topics to be investigated within the Scandinavian dialect syntax project. A list of topics had been assembled during the spring of 2005 on the basis of local meetings in the various groups. In Leikanger the participants were divided into seven thematic groups mostly according to interests and experience, but also so that a good spread of native Scandinavian languages across the groups was achieved. The group work was well received and led to even further amassment of topics. The results from the work in the various groups was briefly presented towards the end of the meeting, and written reports from most of the groups can be found in the project discussion forum at <http://forum.scandiasyn.uit.no/>.

Further details concerning the 1st Grand Meeting for Scandinavian Dialect Syntax can be found at the web site <http://uit.no/scandiasyn/leikanger>.

Tromsø, March 2007

Kristine Bentzen

Øystein Alexander Vangsnæs