

## SYNTACTIC DOUBLING PHENOMENA IN SCANDINAVIAN ØYSTEIN ALEXANDER VANGSNES

This paper will on the one hand provide a shortlist of syntactic doubling phenomena in Scandinavian and on the other hand in on a few selected topics for which a more detailed exposition will be provided. Four other talks at the conference will discuss specific doubling phenomena in Scandinavian, namely:

- (i) Resumption; doubling of an extracted *wh*-subject (by a weak resumptive pronoun) in Northern Norwegian (Taraldsen)
- (ii) Tense/mood/aspect doubling in verbal complements in Swedish (and Norwegian) dialects (Wiklund)
- (iii) Subject pronominal doubling, sentence finally and sentence internally in Solv (Finland Swedish) (Östman)
- (iv) Preposition doubling in Icelandic (Jónsson)

The list of doubling phenomena in Scandinavian can be enlarged with at least the following topics, largely drawing on the so-called “Leikanger-list” of points of syntactic variation across Scandinavian varieties:

1. Negation/modal particle doubling in Finland Swedish dialects
2. Complementizer doubling (‘... that it SUBJ ...’) in the Sunnmøre dialect of Norwegian plus other cases
3. Double infinitive markers ( $\pm P$  preceding the infinitive marker; variation across the varieties)
4. Double definiteness (‘the big house-DEF’) in Norwegian, Swedish, and Faroese.
5. Double indefiniteness (‘a big a house’) in Northern Swedish and Northern Norwegian dialects.
6. Demonstrative reinforcement (‘the here-INFL here house-DEF here’) in Mainland Scandinavian

The issues raised by Östman’s paper bear on the following two conceivably distinct phenomena:

7. Subject clitic doubling in Swedish dialects (Älvdalen, Finland Swedish)
8. Right peripheral tagging (colloquial Mainland Scandinavian)

Subject clitic doubling appears to be quite restricted to just a few Swedish dialects (although we do not really know), whereas right peripheral tagging seems quite widespread in colloquial Mainland Scandinavian. The negation/modal particle doubling in Finland Swedish dialects (1) may furthermore be seen in view of right peripheral tagging: it appears that a prerequisite for the negation/modal doubling is that the element to be doubled appears sentence initially, and likewise right peripheral tagging typically doubles a topicalized DP.

The topic raised by Taraldsen bears a certain affinity with the following issue:

9. *som*-insertion in *wh*-questions in Mainland Scandinavian

In Mainland Scandinavian in general the element *som* (which otherwise introduce relatives and occurs in clefts, comparatives and other constructions) must follow an

embedded *wh*-subject, but cannot follow other *wh*-constituents, and in many dialects *som* rather than *at* introduces the embedded clause when a *wh*-subject is extracted to the matrix left periphery. In other words *som* can be argued to resume the embedded subject position.

In the latter part of the presentation, I will focus on details concerning the three DP-internal phenomena mentioned above (4-6), in particular the last two. Double definiteness is a well-known and extensively discussed property of Faroese, Norwegian, and Swedish. Briefly put, the phenomenon involves the presence of lexical preadjectival article alongside the definite suffix on the noun in adjective–noun combinations. Less well-known is the phenomenon that Delsing (1993) terms ‘double indefiniteness’ and which is found in Northern Swedish and Northern Norwegian dialects. Unlike the cases of indefinite determiner doubling mentioned in the call for papers (and taken up by Kallulli and Rothmayr) the Scandinavian double indefiniteness is not necessarily triggered by *too* or *so* modification of the adjective, and the doubling may occur recursively. The following examples are taken from Delsing (1993:143).

- (1) a. e stort e hus *Northern Swedish*  
       *a big a house*  
       b. en ful en kar  
       *a ugly a guy*  
       c. en stor en ful en kar  
       *a big a ugly a guy*

The postadjectival indefinite articles do not appear obligatorily, and according to Delsing their presence appears to be triggered by emphasis on the adjective that precedes them. In this respect there is thus a rather clear correlation with cases where indefinite articles follow adjectives modified by *so* and *too* (which indeed are found more generally in non-standard Mainland Scandinavian just like in non-standard Dutch and German).

Demonstrative reinforcement is found in all varieties of Scandinavian, and in some varieties such combinations of a determiner and a locative adverb (*here* and *there*) have replaced the regular demonstrative determiners. In colloquial Norwegian it is possible to have as many as three instances of a locative adverb in such demonstrative DPs. Consider the examples in (2).

- (2) a. denne boka *Norwegian*  
       *this book-DEF*  
       b. den herre boka  
       *the here.INFL book-DEF*  
       c. den herre her boka  
       *the here.INFL here book-DEF*  
       d. den herre her boka her  
       *the here.INFL here book-DEF here*  
       e. den herre boka her  
       *the here.INFL book-DEF here*

It is of some interest to notice that the first instance of the adverb carries what can be argued to be adjectival inflection, and as made evident by Leu (2005), it is this instance that is the real demonstrative *reinforcer* in the sense that it is compatible with

both a deictic and an anaphoric use (like the original demonstrative) whereas the presence of the other instances automatically will trigger a deictic interpretation only.

In a wider comparative perspective the multiple occurrences of deictic elements that can appear in the Scandinavian noun phrase raise some questions as to where deixis and demonstrativity are located within the functional structure of the noun phrase. In keeping the broader picture of Scandinavian noun phrase syntax in sight I will present arguments to claim that the three instances are structurally ordered so that the inflected instance is most deeply embedded and that the surfacing order results from a series of DP-internal phrasal roll-up movements that eventually renders the inflected reinforcer in the left periphery of the noun phrase.

#### **REFERENCES**

- Delsing, Lars-Olof. 1993. 'The internal structure of noun phrases in the Scandinavian languages: a comparative study'. Doctoral dissertation, University of Lund.
- Leu, Thomas. 2005. A note on *these* Germanic demonstratives. Ms., New York University.