John Benjamins Publishing Company

Introduction

Höskuldur Thráinsson, Caroline Heycock,
Hjalmar P. Petersen and Zakaris Svabo Hansen
University of Iceland / University of Edinburgh /
University of the Faroe Islands / University of the Faroe Islands

1. Background

Recent decades have seen a growing interest in the study of syntactic variation. While it is probably fair to say that variation in syntax was for a long time relatively neglected by sociolinguists and dialectologists, this has changed. Similarly, many generative syntacticians used to believe in the following statement by Chomsky (1965: 4):

> Linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech-community, who knows its language perfectly …

Hence variation within speech communities, let alone variation within the language of individual speakers, was considered theoretically uninteresting by many generative syntacticians. This has also changed.

The increased interest in syntactic variation among theoretical syntacticians is arguably of two kinds: Interest in macro-comparison and in micro-comparison. In macro-comparative studies linguists are comparing languages that are very different from each other and possibly genetically unrelated. Micro-comparative studies, on the other hand, compare closely related languages or dialects. The Principles and Parameters approach to syntax proposed by Chomsky (1981) led to a new and conceptually different interest in comparative syntax. The basic idea was that certain principles are invariant across languages and the observed differences among languages can to a large extent be described in terms of different values for particular parameters. This approach led to a fruitful and popular research program where syntacticians tried to describe the relevant parameters and test the predictions that followed from their formulations. Much of this work was macro-comparative: Linguists were comparing languages that were believed to be quite different from each other but nevertheless could be shown to have the same values for particular parameters.

One of the most influential works within the P&P framework is undoubtedly Holmberg and Platzack's book *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax* (1995, see also the paper by Holmberg and Platzack 1991). In their book they maintain that the Scandinavian languages fall into two main groups, "one comprising Icelandic, Old Scandinavian, and Faroese, the other comprising Danish, Norwegian and Swedish" (Holmberg and Platzack 1985: 3). Following Haugen (1976: 23) they refer to these groups as *Insular Scandinavian* (ISc) and *Mainland Scandinavian* (MSc), respectively (1995: 5, passim). This has become a popular way of grouping these languages and it has influenced the research represented in this volume – and is reflected in its name.[1]

It soon became clear, however, that the division of the Scandinavian languages into ISc and MSc was not as clearcut and simple as originally assumed by Holmberg and Platzack. Thus Barnes (1992) maintained that Faroese only had some of the syntactic properties that an ISc language should have according to Holmberg and Platzack (1991) and this triggered a lively discussion about the syntactic properties of Faroese and its status among the Scandinavian languages (see e.g. Vikner 1995, Bobaljik and Thráinsson 1998, Rohrbacher 1999, Petersen 2000, 2002, Thráinsson 2001, 2003, Jónsson and Eythórsson 2005, etc.).

Having pointed out that Faroese did not seem to have all the syntactic properties that an ISc language should have, Barnes (1992: 34) suggested that the reason could be "that the traditional belief in strong Danish syntactic penetration to Faroese may have some validity. Faroese syntax would then not (or not only) be a system in the throes of change, but two systems, the one superimposed on the other. Clearly, much work needs to be done if this idea is to be raised above the level of speculation …" This was one of the issues investigated in the project *Variation in Multilingualism on the Faroe Islands* (commonly referred to as K8), initiated by Kurt Braunmüller at the University of Hamburg and with the main results published in Petersen (2010).

In their original work on the syntactic classification of the Scandinavian languages, Holmberg and Platzack did not pay much attention to possible variation **within** the languages. But the explicit predictions made by their parametric approach made it clear that it would not only be interesting to compare the (standard) Scandinavian languages but also to look for syntactic dialects within them, i.e. to do research that was even more micro-comparative than Holmberg and Platzack's.

---

1.   It should be mentioned, however, that the term *Scandinavian* is sometimes used about Danish, Norwegian and Swedish only and the term *Nordic* is then used as a broader cover term including Icelandic and Faroese. Outside linguistics, e.g. in politics and sociology, *Nordic* also includes anything Finnish, as Finland is one of the Nordic (and even Scandinavian) countries.

The first organized effort in this direction was made within the research network *Scandinavian Dialect Syntax* (ScanDiaSyn, see the description at http://websim. arkivert.uit.no/scandiasyn/network%3fLanguage=en). Research groups in all the Scandinavian countries (including Finland) participated in the network, together with associated research groups in Edinburgh, Amsterdam and Padova. The projects were partially coordinated, first within ScanDiaSyn and later through the *Nordic Centre of Excellence in Microcomparative Syntax* (NORMS) and the research networks *Nordic Language Variation Network* (NLVN) and *Nordic Collaboration on Language Variation* (N'CLAV, see https://spraakbanken.gu.se/nclav). The networks and the center of excellence received various grants from Scandinavian research funds but the research within the groups was supported by local research funds. Some of the data collected in these projects have been made publicly accessible in the *Nordic Dialect Corpus* and the *Nordic Syntax Database*, and and some of the variation documented is described in publications in the electronic journal *The Nordic Atlas of Language Structures Journal* (for further information see http://www. tekstlab.uio.no/nals#/intro/data_resources). Most of the pan-Scandinavian organizatorial work behind all of this was led by Øystein Vangsnes and Peter Svenonius (Tromsø) and Janne Bondi Johannessen (Oslo).

Because of the projects mentioned above we now have a much more detailed picture than before of syntactic variation within Scandinavia, both between ISc and MSc and within them. Many of the studies that grew out of these projects discuss, in one way or another, variation within ISc, such as the aspects of Faroese syntax that appear to distinguish it from Icelandic. The question of possible Danish influence on Faroese syntax, and Faroese-Danish bilingualism, has also been an important one in this research (see e.g. Jónsson and Eythórsson 2011, Wiklund et al. 2007, Bentzen et al. 2009, Strahan 2009a,b, 2011, Jónsson 2009, 2013, Petersen 2010, Thráinsson 2010, 2013, 2015, Holmberg 2010, Heycock et al. 2010, 2012, 2013, Angantýsson 2011, Eythórsson et al. 2012, Hansen 2015, Sigurjónsdóttir 2015, Eythórsson 2015, etc.). The present volume is in some ways a continuation of this discussion.

In the remainder of this Introduction we will outline some of the major topics discussed in the papers of this volume and describe the nature of the contributions. Section 2 describes the main methods used in the research reported on, and comments on the methodological relevance of some of the papers. Section 3 outlines the major descriptive and comparative issues dealt with in the papers. Section 4 points out some theoretical contributions made by the papers and Section 5 concludes.

2. The data

In discussions of syntactic variation it is typically necessary to collect a representative sample of data to document the variation. Table 1 gives an overview of the various data collection methods used in the studies reported on in this volume (the abbreviations *Ic* and *Fa* refer to Icelandic and Faroese, respectively, and *var.* in the age column means that the subjects were of varying age).

Table 1. An overview of the data collection methods.

Studies	Judgments		Production		Corpora		
	Age	N	Age	N	Internet	*Tímarit*	Special
Thráinsson (Ic)	var.	700+					
Thráinsson (Fa)	var.	300+					
Eythórsson & Thráinsson (Ic)	var.	700+	var.	700+			
Eythórsson & Thráinsson (Fa)	var.	300+					
Nowenstein (Ic)	6–7	80					x
Nowenstein (Fa)					x		
Nowenstein (NAmIc)							x
Petersen (Fa)	17–20	113/73/155					x
Jónsson (Ic)					x	x	
Ussery (Ic)	20–28	10					
Wood, E. F. Sigurðsson & Nowenstein (Ic)	var.	130					
Hartmann & Heycock (Ic)			var.	72/75			
Hartmann & Heycock (Fa)			var.	51			
Angantýsson (Ic)	15&65+	420					
Angantýsson (Fa)	var.	78					
H. Á. Sigurðsson (Ic)					x	x	

It should be noted that the numbers in the N-column do not tell the whole story about the extensiveness of the studies because the large overview studies (cf. the papers by Thráinsson, Eythórsson and Angantýsson) included a large number of different constructions and hence there were relatively few examples of each type. Studies with a smaller number of participants were typically more focused, concentrating on a particular syntactic phenomenon. This is true for Ussery's study, for instance, where a limited number of speakers were consulted but a large number of systematically varied examples tested. It should also be noted that Table 1 does not give a complete picture of the variation data drawn on in the studies since most of them contain explicit and systematic comparison with previous studies, which in turn were based on different data.

As Table 1 shows, a majority of the studies elicited acceptability judgments from the speakers, most making use of a Likert scale, but sometimes the speakers were asked to choose between two or more variants that they were presented with.[2] In the production experiments the speakers were asked to fill in blanks (Eythórsson and Thráinsson, Hartmann and Heycock). Two of the studies (Nowenstein and Petersen) compare corpus data to experimental data, using special corpora compiled for research purposes (a corpus of spontaneous child language, a corpus of letters written in North American Icelandic and a corpus of various Faroese texts). Three studies make systematic use of Internet data (Nowenstein, Jónsson, H. Á. Sigurðsson) and two (Jónsson and H. Á. Sigurðsson) searched the large open access library *timarit.is*, which hosts newspapers and magazines published in Iceland and the Faroe Islands and Greenland, going back to the 19th century.

3. Descriptive topics

Unsurprisingly, the studies of this volume center around many of the constructions or syntactic phenomena that have figured extensively in recent discussion of Scandinavian syntax. This can be seen from the list in (1):

(1) a. **subject case** (Eythórsson and Thráinsson; Nowenstein; Thráinsson; Jónsson; Wood, E. F. Sigurðsson and Nowenstein)
   b. **object case** (Petersen; Jónsson; Ussery; Thráinsson; Wood, E. F. Sigurðsson and Nowenstein;)
   c. **agreement** (Ussery; Hartmann and Heycock)
   d. **embedded clause word order** (Thráinsson; H. Á. Sigurðsson)
   e. **Stylistic Fronting** (Angantýsson; H. Á. Sigurðsson; Thráinsson)
   f. **expletive constructions** (Angantýsson; Thráinsson)

As the list in (1) suggests, some of the studies concentrate on one or two phenomena and try to get a better understanding of them by studying them, and the variation involved, in more detail than has been done before. Thus the familiar topic of subject case marking is discussed in the papers by Eythórsson & Thráinsson and by Nowenstein, while Petersen focuses on object case in Faroese. Ussery and Hartmann & Heycock deal solely with (different kinds of) agreement and Angantýsson and H. Á. Sigurðsson concentrate on Stylistic Fronting (SF),

---

2. In the child language experiment (Nowenstein) the children were helping a puppet to choose between different case forms that they were presented with in each context.

although they also consider its relationship to verb-initial (V1) order in embedded clauses and to expletive constructions, e.g. in examples like the following (from Sigurðsson's paper):

(2) a. *þegar* __ *verður komið í …*   V1
   when   will-be come   into
   'when I/we/they will get into …'

   b. *þegar **komið** verður t heim …*   SF
      when come   will-be   home
      'when I/we/they will get (back) home …'

   c. *þegar **það** verður komið heim …*   expl.
      when there will-be come   home
      'when I/we/they will get (back) home …'

Thráinsson's paper, on the other hand, touches upon a range of constructions, partly comparing Icelandic and Faroese and partly illustrating the effects and properties of different data collection methods.

While the list of topics in (1) will look familiar to those who have followed recent research on Scandinavian syntax, this is partly deceptive. First, many of the studies investigate the relevant topics in much greater detail than has been done before, as already mentioned. Second, several studies are based on new kinds of data and hence offer a new perspective on the topic. Third, some studies concentrate on a particular aspect of the topic under discussion that has not figured in previous discussion to the same extent. Fourth, a few authors pick up on apparently marginal data that have been discovered in previous studies but not paid much attention to. Here are some illustrative examples.

First, Petersen's study of object case marking in the language of young Faroese speakers is more extensive than any study of its kind and the results can be profitably compared to those reported on in Malmsten's study (2015) of the use of dative in student essays in the Faroese Senior High School 1940–1999. One of the issues investigated by Petersen is to what extent the semantics of the verbs favors dative case assignment to the object, as had been argued by Jónsson (2009).

Second, H. Á. Sigurðsson's study of the use of Stylistic Fronting (SF) sheds a new light on the construction and its properties by extensive searches in large corpora. This is an important contribution since the **use** of SF has not been studied in detail before. Similarly, the inclusion of child language data and consideration of data from North American Icelandic allow Nowenstein to develop new argumentation to help determine the nature of the previously observed person variation in Dative Substitution (Dative Sickness) in Icelandic.

Third, Ussery considers the variable agreement with nominative objects in Icelandic in more close detail than has hitherto been done, in constructions like the following, for instance (based on the discussion in Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008):

(3) a. *Einum málfræðingi   líkaði/líkuðu þessar hugmyndir.*
         one   linguist.DAT.SG liked.SG/PL   these ideas.NOM.PL
         'One linguist liked these ideas.'

     b. *Það líkaði/líkuðu einum málfræðingi   þessar hugmyndir.*
         there liked.SG/PL   one   linguist.DAT.SG these ideas.NOM.PL
         'One linguist liked these ideas.'

Here one of the questions is to what extent the dative subject intervening between the finite verb and the nominative object in examples of the *b*-type prevents the verb from agreeing with the object in number (the so-called "Dative intervention effect"), as discussed by Sigurðsson and Holmberg (2008). This turned out to vary from speaker to speaker. Interestingly, Ussery also found some evidence for number agreement with Dat subjects, something that had previously been found for Faroese but not Icelandic.

Hartmann and Heycock's paper also deals with agreement, namely copular agreement in Icelandic and Faroese under different conditions. Their test battery included cases where the copula variably agrees with one of two DPs in so-called specificational sentences, including contrast of the sort illustrated in (4):

(4) a. vandamálið   **er/eru** foreldrarnir   (Ic)
         trupulleikin   **er/eru** foreldrini   (Fa)
         trouble.SG.DEF is/are   parents.PL.DEF

     b. Frá   mínum sjónarhóli **er/eru** vandamálið   foreldrarnir   (Ic)
         from my   poc1-of-view is/are   trouble.SG.DEF parents.PL.DEF

         Eftir mínari meining **er/eru** trupulleikin   foreldrini   (Fa)
         in   my   opinion is/are   trouble.SG.DEF parents.PL.DEF

         'In my opinion, the problem is the parents.'

As shown here, both pairs of examples contain a singular DP1 preceding a plural DP2.[3] The crucial difference between the sentence pairs just illustrated is that in the *b*-examples the initial PP triggers subject-verb inversion and hence both DP1 and DP2 follow the finite verb. Agreement with DP2 turned out to be possible (and

---

3. Examples of the *a*-type were embedded in contexts that were intended to rule out Topicalization (A′-movement) of the predicative DP and "subject-verb inversion", i.e. an analysis where the second DP was actually the subject.

even preferred) in the *a*-examples but the order *verb–DP1–DP2* strongly favored agreement with DP1 in both languages. Like Ussery (and previously Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008), Hartmann and Heycock also discovered that agreement in Icelandic may be a more complex phenomenon than commonly thought. Thus they found some evidence for partial agreement in examples of the following type, where some speakers inserted a verbal form that appears to agree with the second DP in number but not person:

(5) *Hann var að velta fyrir sér hvort   aðalvandamálið   **væru** þið*.
     he   was wondering   whether main problem.3SG be.3PL you.2PL
     'He was wondering whether the main problem was you(pl.).'

Facts of this sort are obviously relevant to theories of agreement.

    Fourth, it has been known for a long time that genitive is a vulnerable case in Icelandic and especially Faroese. Genitive subjects and objects have completely disappeared in Faroese. They are very rare in Icelandic, and indeed possibly on the way out in this language too. This is reviewed in Jónsson's paper, but he also investigates special instances of what he calls Genitive Avoidance in Icelandic, where Gen is replaced by other cases, most interestingly by Dat, e.g. in constructions of the kind illustrated in (6) (based on attested examples in Jónsson's paper):

(6) *og   minnast   **hennar** sem óvenjulegrar/**óvenjulegri** konu*.
     and remember her.GEN   as   unusual.GEN/DAT woman.GEN/DAT
     'and remember her as an unusual woman.'

Interestingly, Dat is the only case that can replace Gen in constructions of this sort, suggesting that there is some kind of structural affinity between Dat and Gen that needs to be captured.

    Finally, Wood, E. F. Sigurðsson and Nowenstein consider a phenomenon that was included "at the last minute" in IceDiaSyn in order to determine if it was "real" or not. They refer to this as "inverse attraction" (IA); it is a phenomenon where the case of a DP in a matrix clause is determined by an element in an embedded relative clause following it, as in examples like the following (based on examples from IceDiaSyn):

(7) *Listaverkin/Listaverkunum [sem __ var stolið] eru   ómetanleg*.
     artwork.DEF.NOM/DAT   that   was stolen are.3PL priceless
     'The art works that were stolen are priceless.'

Here the Nom *listaverkin* would be the "standard" variant – the matrix clause being *listaverkin … eru ómetanleg* 'the artworks (Nom) are priceless'. The embedded relative clause is related to *listaverkunum var stolið* 'the artworks (Dat) were stolen',

where the passive would take a Dat subject because *stela* 'steal' takes a Dat object and the (lexical) Dat case would be preserved in the passive. The relative clause in (7) has a subject gap so this Dat does not show up within it, but it turns out that some speakers of Icelandic allow the matrix subject to "attract" this Dat case. The results of IceDiaSyn showed that IA is actually quite commonly accepted. Wood et al. show that various structural facts affect the acceptability of IA, including the following:

(8)   a.   The position of the gap in the relative clause matters. IA is better with subject gaps (as in (7)) than with object gaps – and gaps within PPs do not seem to allow IA (although this was not explicitly investigated in the study).

b.   The case frame is relevant – the most acceptable instances of IA appear to involve attraction of Dat replacing a matrix Nom.

c.   IA seems to be better if the DP hosting the relative clause is in subject position than if it is in object position.

This obviously raises the question of what kind of analysis of relative clauses offers the most promising account of these facts.

This brings us to the question dealt with in the next section: How do the authors use the data that they report on? What do they see as their main theoretical relevance?

4.   Theoretical and comparative issues

4.1   Methodology

Thráinsson's paper is mainly concerned with methodological issues. His arguments include the following:

(9)   a.   In linguistic communities where there is extensive inter-speaker and intra-speaker variation but no clear regional dialects, one will not get a reliable picture of the distribution of different variants by just consulting a few speakers. Syntactic variation in Icelandic and Faroese is of this kind.

b.   While it may be true that it is easier for speakers to give relative judgments (e.g. by comparing two or more variants) than absolute judgments (e.g. by evaluating the acceptability of individual examples), these two methods do not give the same kind of information. Hence it would be profitable to use both when eliciting variation data.

    c.   Similarly, forced-choice experiments do not yield the same kind of information about speakers' intuition as absolute judgments do. Thus these two types of elicitation can complement each other.

    d.   Although some speakers may be reluctant to reveal their judgments about certain variants, investigators should not try to get around this problem by asking speakers what they think other speakers in the communty would say or be most likely to use, e.g. by asking "Which variant do you consider to be the most common one in your local dialect?" First, there is no reason to believe that speakers are a reliable source about other speakers' preferences and use. Second, asking about other speakers' use is a metalinguistic question and thus different in nature from ways of trying to get at speakers' own intuition.

H. Á. Sigurðsson demonstrates in his paper that careful use of Internet data, combined in this case with the on-line library *timarit.is*, can add an important dimension to variation studies. Jónsson also uses the same sources, while Petersen and Nowenstein add data from corpora to supplement data obtained by other means.

4.2   Comparative Insular Scandinavian

As Table 1 reveals, some of the studies compare data from Icelandic and Faroese. This is done, for instance, in Eythórsson & Thráinsson's paper to show that the development of subject case has followed similar paths in the two languages although one can argue that it has gone further in Faroese. Nowenstein also emphasizes the similarity between Icelandic and Faroese (and North American Icelandic!) in subject case assignment, in particular with respect to Person-Specific Retention, where traditional Dat case is better preserved on first and second person subjects than on third person subjects.

    Explicit comparison of Icelandic and Faroese is also done in Hartmann & Heycock's paper on agreement. They show that there are many similarities between the two languages in copular agreement, e.g. in specificational sentences of the type described above (see the examples in (4)), despite some differences in detail. A similar conclusion is reached by Angantýsson, who compares SF and related constructions in the two languages.

    Although Petersen's paper is devoted to a study of object case marking in Faroese only, he makes certain references to object case marking in Icelandic. Although he points out that Dat objects are found in Faroese with the same kind of verbs as in Icelandic to a certain extent, he argues that Dat may no longer be a productive object case in Faroese, although it is obviously very much alive in Icelandic according to many studies (e.g. Barðdal 2001, 2008). He also brings up

the issue of possible Danish influence, a question he has studied in detail in other publications (e.g. Petersen 2010).

Finally, Thráinsson raises the related issue – but without addressing the question of causation – of whether Faroese may be losing some of its ISc properties and moving towards MSc. Comparing the acceptance by Faroese speakers from different age groups of four (allegedly) typical ISc constructions, namely dative subjects, Stylistic Fronting, the transitive expletive construction and the order Vf-Adv (finite verb before adverb) in embedded clauses, he concludes that although there is some evidence that younger speakers are less likely on the average to accept these constructions (except for the Vf-Adv order), this tendency would at most represent a very slow movement of Faroese from the ISc to the MSc group.

4.3   Acquisition, change and the nature of variation

The main topic of Eythórsson and Thráinsson's paper is the historical development of subject case. They claim that the Case Directionality Hypothesis (CDH) originally proposed by Eythórsson (2002) to a large extent predicts the observed development of subject case marking in Faroese and Icelandic. This hypothesis builds on the division of case into *structural* and *lexical* on the one hand and then of lexical case into *regular* (thematic) and *idiosyncratic* (quirky), a division that goes back to the well known paper by Yip, Maling and Jackendoff (1987). Thus they claim that the main differences in subject case marking between the two languages result from a faster movement of Faroese along the path predicted by the CDH, which states that:

– lexical case will yield to structural case
– idiosyncratic lexical case will yield to regular lexical case

They admit, however, that certain facts about subject case marking in the two languages call for additional explanations. This is true, for instance, of the "impersonalization" found in the history of both languages, where lexical subject case appears to have replaced structural subject case, suggesting that lexical case can sometimes be more productive than the CDH predicts.

Nowenstein discusses a more formal approach to acquisition – and hence change and variation. She wants to give a formal account of the acquisition of (lexical) subject case in an environment where inter-speaker (and intra-speaker) variation is prevalent. Previous studies of subject case marking and Dative Substitution (DS, i.e. instances where regular Dat is substituted for irregular Acc as a subject case) had shown that speakers were more likely to retain the original Acc case on 1st and 2nd person pronouns than 3rd person subjects (pronominal or non-pronominal). It

had been suggested that this might be the result of self-correction by speakers due to the negative attitude in (parts of) the linguistic community towards DS. Nowenstein demonstrates, however, that this Person-Specific Retention (retention of the traditional case) is also found in the language of young children, where self-correction is unlikely, and even in the language of speakers of North American Icelandic, where there is no sociolinguistic pressure favoring the traditional case. She then goes on to account for this aspect of subject case acquisition in terms of Yang's model of variational acquisition (2002, 2016). The nature of variation, especially intra-speaker variation, is also discussed in Thráinsson's paper, where it is related to Yang's model and to the concept of parameters. The existence, and persistence, of intra-speaker variation is obviously unexpected under standard assumptions about binary parameters if the variation in question is supposed to be parametric.

4.4   Syntactic structure

Finally, several papers use the variation data reported on to argue for a particular syntactic analysis of the constructions involved. Jónsson, for instance, wants to explain the fact that in certain constructions it is possible to substitute (lexical) Dat for Gen. In such situations one might have expected that the structural (or default) cases Nom and Acc would have been better candidates than Dat, but they are not. To explain this, one needs to find a property that Dat and Gen share, to the exclusion of Nom and Acc. Following a proposal by Bayer, Bader and Meng (2001), he suggests that Dat and Gen are dominated by a special KP (Kase Phrase) in such instances "whereas nominatives and accusatives are merely DPs". He also points out that paradigms of noun inflection in Icelandic arguably support the claim that Dat and Gen have a special status.

Ussery uses the agreement data she presents to argue for a particular analysis of the ECM-construction exemplified in (10):

(10)   *Einhverjum   nemanda   fannst/fundust* [*þessi   próf*
      some   student.DAT.SG found.SG/PL   these exams.NOM.PL

      vera   ósanngjörn]
      be.INF   unfair

      'Some student found these exams to be unfair.'

Some speakers have a preference for number agreement of the matrix verb *finnast* 'find', where the plural form *fundust* agrees with the nominative plural subject *þessi próf* of the embedded infinitival clause (the ECM-clause in Ussery's terms). Other speakers prefer non-agreement (the singular form *fannst* of the verb). Ussery argues that this difference depends on the speaker's analysis of the infinitival clause:

If speakers analyze it as a TP, the clause-boundary will block agreement. If they analyze it as (the smaller) *v*P, agreement can apply. She represents these alternatives schematically as in (11):

(11)   a.   Dat V [$_{TP}$Nom …] default on matrix verb
      b.   Dat V [$_{vP}$Nom …] agreement on matrix verb

For some speakers, then, ECM-clauses of this kind are always TPs and they disallow the agreement. For others the *v*P analysis is a possibility and they allow agreement.

    Hartmann & Heycock also use agreement variation data to argue for particular structural analyses. Among the facts they aim to account for is the inter-language variation in agreement in specificational structures. Icelandic and Faroese are in certain respects similar to German and Dutch in that they allow DP2-agreement in constructions where English does not. They argue that movement to Spec,TP is more restricted in English than it is in Icelandic, Faroese, German and Dutch. In English, movement to Spec,TP is restricted to elements with which T is already agreeing. In Dutch and German other elements can reach Spec,TP via Scrambling, and in Icelandic and Faroese it is known that various kinds of elements can occupy Spec,TP without agreeing with T, e.g. non-nominative subjects and SF-elements. If this analysis is on the right track, it makes the interesting prediction that there will be a correlation between the acceptance (and use) of SF and non-nominative subjects on the one hand and DP2 agreement on the other, a prediction that Hartmann & Heycock want to test in more detail.

    One of the theoretically interesting contributions of Angantýsson's paper is his demonstration of the distributional differences between overt expletives and SF-elements. Holmberg had maintained in an influential paper (2000) that SF and expletive "insertion" are equivalent in Icelandic and that SF basically demonstrates that any category can be an expletive. Angantýsson shows, on the other hand, that there are contexts where SF is accepted but overt expletives are not. There is a difference between Icelandic and Faroese in this respect, however: Both SF and overt expletives are acceptable in certain types of relative clauses in Faroese whereas Icelandic only allows SF but not overt expletives in this context. Angantýsson suggests that this may indicate that "the expletive in Faroese is not as strictly limited to a high (pre-finite V) position as it is in Icelandic". Angantýsson's paper also contains a discussion of topicalization in relative clauses. He presents his analysis in terms of Bhatt's proposal (2002) about the structure of relative clauses, where the noun that the relative clause modifies "originates within the relative clause and moves to a clause-external position," and maintains that the impossibility of topicalization (including SF) in relative clauses with an overt subject is an intervention effect. The fact that some speakers (especially older speakers according to Angantýsson's data) allow fronting of XPs in relative clauses with a subject gap then calls for a

different explanation. Angantýsson discusses the possibility that SF is restricted to head movement for (most of) the younger speakers while the majority of the older speakers in fact allow SF of XPs.

Finally, Wood, E. F. Sigurðsson and Nowenstein also discuss different analyses of relative clauses in their paper on inverse attraction (IA). They argue, for instance, that an analysis offered by Bianchi (1999) of IA in Latin cannot be extended to the Icelandic instances of IA. Having demonstrated the various properties of Icelandic IA in considerable detail, they conclude, however, that still more data about are needed: "Once the rest of the basic properties of IA are worked out, it will serve as a fertile testing ground for the details of, and distinctions between, the null operator, raising, and matching analyses of relative clauses."

5. Concluding remarks

In the best case, linguistic theory and analysis exist in a symbiotic relationship. The close analysis of specific phenomena within specific linguistic varieties can engender new hypotheses about aspects of linguistic theory, or provide evidence that corroborates or falsifies existing hypotheses. A case in point would be the discovery of cross-serial dependencies arising from the particular types of verb clusters found in Dutch and Swiss German, which proved that the grammars of natural languages cannot all be context-free (Bresnan et al. 1982, Shieber 1985). Conversely, advances in linguistic theory make possible more adequate and insightful analyses of particular varieties. One of countless examples of this would be application of the new developments in the theory of the morphosyntax of the perfect (see in particular Iatridou et al 2003) to the diachronic syntax of English and the synchronic variation across Scandinavian (see for example McFadden and Alexiadou 2010, Larsson 2009). We believe that the research reported in this volume exemplifies both aspect of this symbiosis between theory and analysis; we look forward to following the new discoveries that we hope it will engender.

References

Angantýsson, Ásgrímur. 2011. *The Syntax of Embedded Clauses in Icelandic and Related Languages*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Iceland. Reykjavík: Hugvísindastofnun.

Barðdal, Jóhanna. 2001. *Case in Icelandic – A Synchronic, Diachronic and Comparative Approach*. Doctoral dissertation, Department of Scandinavian Languages, Lund University, Lund. [Lundastudier i nordisk språkvetenskap A57]

Barðdal, Jóhanna. 2008. *Productivity. Evidence from Case and Argument Structure in Icelandic*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/cal.8

Barnes, Michael P. 1992. "Faroese Syntax – Achievements, Goals and Problems." In *The Nordic Languages and Modern Linguistics* 7, ed. by Jonna Louis-Jensen and Jóhan H. W. Poulsen, 17–37. Tórshavn: Føroya Fróðskaparfelag.

Bayer, Joseph, Markus Bader and Michael Meng. 2001. "Morphological Underspecification Meets Oblique Case: Syntactic and Processing Effects in German." *Lingua* 111: 465–514. doi:10.1016/S0024-3841(00)00041-3

Bentzen, Kristine, Piotr Garbacz, Caroline Heycock and Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson. 2009. "Variation in Faroese Verb Placement." *Nordlyd* 36 (2): 78–102. NORMS Papers on Faroese, ed. by Peter Svenonius, Kristine Bentzen, Caroline Heycock, Jógvan í Lon Jacobsen, Janne Bondi Johannessen, Jeffrey K. Parrott, Tania E. Strahan and Øystein Alexander Vangsnes. Tromsø: CASTL.

Bhatt, Rajesh. 2002. "The Raising Analysis of Relative Clauses: Evidence from Adjectival Modification." *Natural Language Semantics* 10: 43–92. doi:10.1023/A:1015536226396

Bianchi, Valentina. 1999. *Consequences of Antisymmetry*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. doi:10.1515/9783110803372

Bobaljik, Jonathan D., and Höskuldur Thráinsson. 1998. "Two Heads Aren't always Better than One." *Syntax* 1: 37–71. doi:10.1111/1467-9612.00003

Bresnan, Joan, Ronald Kaplan, Stanley Peters and Annie Zaenen. 1982. "Cross-serial Dependencies in Dutch." *Linguistic Inquiry* 13: 613–615.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Eythórsson, Thórhallur. 2002. "Changes in Subject Case-marking in Icelandic." In *Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change*, ed. by David Lightfoot, 196–212. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199250691.003.0011

Eythórsson, Thórhallur. 2015. "The Insular Nordic Experimental Kitchen: Changes in Case Marking in Icelandic and Faroese." In *An Intimacy of Words/Innileiki orðanna: Essays in Honour of Pétur Knútsson / Festschrift til heiðurs Pétri Knútssyni*, ed. by Matthew Whelpton, Guðrún Björk Guðsteinsdóttir, Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir and Martin Regal, 328–352. Reykjavík: University of Iceland Press.

Eythórsson, Thórhallur, Janne Bondi Johannessen, Signe Laake and Tor A. Åfarli. 2012. "Dative Case in Norwegian, Icelandic and Faroese: Preservation and Non-preservation." *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 35: 219–249. doi:10.1017/S0332586513000036

Hansen, Zakaris Svabo. 2015. "Máltaka í broyting. Sagnorðsflyting hjá føroyskum børnum." ['Acquisition in the process of change. Verb movement in the language of Faroese children.'] In *Frændafundur* 8, ed. by Turið Sigurðardóttir and María Anna Garðarsdóttir, 215–228. Tórshavn: Fróðskapur.

Haugen, Einar. 1976. *The Scandinavian Languages: An Introduction to their History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Heycock, Caroline, Antonella Sorace and Zakaris S. Hansen. 2010. "V-to-I and V2 in Subordinate Clauses: An Investigation of Faroese in Relation to Icelandic and Danish." *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 13 (3): 61–91. doi:10.1007/s10828-010-9035-7

Heycock, Caroline, Antonella Sorace, Zakaris S. Hansen, Frances Wilson and Sten Vikner. 2012. "Detecting the Late Stages of Syntactic Change: The Loss of V-to-T in Faroese." *Language* 88 (3): 558–600. doi:10.1353/lan.2012.0053

Heycock, Caroline, Antonella Sorace, Zakaris Svabo Hansen, Frances Wilson. 2013. "Acquisition in Variation (and Vice Versa): V-to-T in Faroese Children." *Language Acquisition* 20 (1): 5–22. doi:10.1080/10489223.2012.738741

Holmberg, Anders. 2000. "Scandinavian Stylistic Fronting: How Any Category Can Become an Expletive." *Linguistic Inquiry* 31: 445–483. doi:10.1162/002438900554406

Holmberg, Anders. 2010. "Parameters in Minimalist Theory: The Case of Scandinavian." *Theoretical Linguistics* 36 (1): 1–48. doi:10.1515/thli.2010.001

Holmberg, Anders, and Christer Platzack. 1991. "On the Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax." In *Issues in Germanic Syntax*, ed. by Werner Abraham, Wim Kosmeijer and Eric Reuland, 93–118. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Holmberg, Anders, and Christer Platzack. 1995. *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Iatridou, Sabine, Elena Anagnostopoulou, and Roumyana Pancheva. 2003. "Observations about the Form and Meaning of the Perfect." in *Perfect Explorations*, ed. by Artemis Alexiadou, Monika Rathert and Arnim von Stechow, 153–204. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. doi:10.1515/9783110902358.153

Jónsson, Jóhannes Gísli. 2009. "Verb Classes and Dative Objects in Insular Scandinavian." In *The Role of Semantic, Pragmatic and Discourse Factors in the Development of Case*, ed. by Jóhanna Barðdal and Shobhana Chelliah, 203–224. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/slcs.108.12jon

Jóhannes Gísli Jónsson. 2013. "Dative versus Accusative and the Nature of Inherent Case." In *Variation in Datives: A Micro-Comparative Perspective*, ed. by Beatriz Fernández and Ricardo Etxepare, 144–160. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jónsson, Jóhannes Gísli, and Thórhallur Eythórsson. 2005. "Variation in Subject Case Marking in Insular Scandinavian." *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 28: 223–245. doi:10.1017/S0332586505001435

Jónsson, Jóhannes Gísli, and Thórhallur Eythórsson. 2011. "Structured Exceptions and Case Selection in Insular Scandinavian." In *Expecting the unexpected: Exceptions in the grammar*, ed. by Horst Simon and Heike Wiese, 213–241. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. doi:10.1515/9783110219098.213

Larsson, Ida. 2009. *Participles in Time. The development of the perfect tense in Swedish*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Gothenburg.

Malmsten, Solveig. 2015. *Dativ i modern färöiska. En fallstudie i grammatisk förändring*. ['*Dative in Modern Faroese. A case study in linguistic change.*'] Doctoral dissertation, University of Uppsala, Uppsala.

McFadden, Thomas, and Artemis Alexiadou. 2010. "Perfects, Resultatives, and Auxiliaries in Earlier English." *Linguistic Inquiry* 41 (3): 389–425. doi:10.1162/LING_a_00002

Petersen, Hjalmar P. 2000. "IP or TP in Modern Faroese." *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 66: 75–83.

Petersen, Hjalmar P. 2002. "Quirky Case in Faroese." *Fróðskaparrit* 50: 63–76.

Petersen, Hjalmar P. 2010. *The Dynamics of Faroese-Danish Language Contact*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Rohrbacher, Bernhard. 1999. *Morpholgy-Driven Syntax: A Theory of V to I Raising and Pro-Drop*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/la.15

Shieber, Stuart. 1985. "Evidence against the Context-freeness of Natural Language." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 8: 333–343. doi:10.1007/BF00630917

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann, and Anders Holmberg. 2008. "Icelandic Dative Intervention: Person and Number are Separate Probes." *Agreement Restrictions*, ed. by Roberta D'Alessandro, Susann Fischer and Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, 251–279. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sigurjónsdóttir, Sigríður. 2015. "Afturbeyging í máli færeyskra barna með nokkrum samanburði við íslensku. ['Reflexivization in Faroese child language with some comparison to Icelandic.'] In *Frændafundur* 8, ed. by Turið Sigurðardóttir and María Anna Garðarsdóttir, 229–251. Tórshavn: Fróðskapur.

Strahan, Tania E. 2009a. Faroese Long-distance Reflexives Face off against Icelandic Long-distance Reflexives. In *Nordlyd* 36 (2): 114–141. Peter Svenonius, Kristine Bentzen, Caroline Heycock, Jógvan í Lon Jacobsen, Janne Bondi Johannessen, Jeffrey K. Parrott, Tania E. Strahan and Øystein Alexander Vangsnes. Tromsø: CASTL.

Strahan, Tania E. 2009b. "Outside-in Binding of Reflexives in Insular Scandinavian." *Proceedings of LFG09*, ed. by Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King, 541–561. CSLI Publications, Stanford University, CA.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2001. "Syntactic Theory for Faroese and Faroese for Syntactic Theory." In *Moderne lingvistiske teorier og færøsk*, ed. by Kurt Braunmüller and Jógvan í Lon Jacobsen, 89–124. Oslo: Novus.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2003. "Syntactic Variation, Historical Development and Minimalism." In *Minimalist Syntax*, ed. by Randall Hendrick, 152–191. Oxford: Blackwell, Oxford. doi:10.1002/9780470758342.ch4

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2010. "Predictable and Unpredictable Sources of Variable Verb and Adverb Placement in Scandinavian." *Lingua* 120: 1062–1088. doi:10.1016/j.lingua.2009.04.003

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2013. "Ideal Speakers and Other Speakers: The Case of Dative and some Other Cases." In *Variation in Datives. A Microcomparative Perspective*, ed. by Beatriz Fernández and Ricardo Etxepare, 161–188. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2015. "Tilbrigði í færeyskri og íslenskri setningagerð." ['Variation in Faroese and Icelandic Syntax.'] In *Frændafundur* 8, ed. by Turið Sigurðardóttir and María Anna Garðarsdóttir, 183–213. Tórshavn: Fróðskapur.

Vikner, Sten. 1995. *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wiklund, Anna-Lena, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, Kristine Bentzen and Thorbjörg Hróarsdóttir. 2007. "Rethinking Scandinavian Verb Movement." *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 10 (3): 203–233. doi:10.1007/s10828-007-9014-9

Yang, Charles. 2002. *Knowledge and Learning in Natural Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yang, Charles. 2016. *The Price of Linguistic Productivity. How Children Learn to Break the Rules of Language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Yip, Moira, Joan Maling and Ray Jackendoff. 1987. "Case in Tiers." *Language* 63: 217–250. doi:10.2307/415655