The distribution of Negation in Scandinavian dialects

Christine Bjerkan Østbø
Department of Linguistics/CASTL, University of Tromsø

1 Introduction

❖ Aim:
- Give a survey of some of the variation with respect to the distribution of negation in (some) Scandinavian dialects, mainly with respect to pronominal subjects.
- Sketch possible positions for negation in the TP-domain.

(1) Negation and full DP-subject in the Scandinavian languages.

	Main clauses	Embedded clauses
Norwegian	XP – NOT – Subject – (NOT)	C – (NOT) – Subject – NOT
Swedish	XP – (NOT) – Subject – NOT	C – (NOT) – Subject – NOT
Danish	XP –Subject – NOT	C – Subject – NOT

(2) The form of the negation in different parts of the Scandinavian dialect area:

Norwegian east, west, north	*ikke, ikkje, ente, itte*
Swedish south	*inte/icke*
Danish	*ikke, itte*
Norwegian central	*itj*
Swedish north	*int/itt*
Finnish-Swedish	*int/itt*

The Main Patterns: negation and pronominal subject

(3) Negation vs. pronominal subject in the Scandinavian dialects investigated here.[1]

Pattern	Dialect	Embedded clauses	Main clauses
1	*Närpes (Finland)*	**C – pron.sub – NOT – V**	**(XP) – v – pron.sub – NOT**
	Nyland (Finland)	C – pron.sub – NOT – V	(XP) – v – pron.sub – NOT
	Älvdalen (Sweden)	C – pron.sub – NOT – V	(XP) – v – pron.sub – NOT
	Northern Norway	C – pron.sub – NOT – V	(XP) – v – pron.sub – NOT
	Eastern Norway	C – pron.sub – NOT – V	(XP) – v – pron.sub – NOT
	Southern Norway	C – pron.sub – NOT – V	(XP) – v – pron.sub – NOT
	Jylland (Denmark)	C – pron.sub – NOT – V	(XP) – v – pron.sub – NOT

[1] Mostly based on existing literature.

	Fyn *Bornholm*		
2	*Oppdal (Norway)*	**C – pron.sub – NOT – V**	**(XP) – v – NOT – pron.sub**
	Norrland (Sweden)		(XP) – v – NOT – pron.sub
3	*North-Western No.*[2]	**C – NOT –pron.sub – V**	**(XP) – v – NOT – pron.sub**
4	*Sjælland (Denmark)*	**C – NOT –pron.sub – V** C – pron.su – V– NOT	**(XP) – v – pron.sub – NOT** (?)
	Stavanger (Norway)	C – NOT –pron.sub – V C – pron.sub – V– NOT	(XP) – v – NOT – pron.sub (XP) – v – pron.sub – NOT

2 Data

2.1 Analysis (Christensen 2005: 77)

(4) $[_{CP}\ [_{FinP}$ **canonical subject position** $Fin^0\ [_{\pi P}$ **shifted object** $\pi^0\ [_{NegP}\ Neg^0\ [TP$ **subject** $T^0\ [_{vP}$ AdvP $[_{vP}$ V

❖ Negation is adjoined to vP and moves to NegP in order to check features
❖ This analysis can easily account for pattern 1

2.2 *Pattern 1*

(5) a. *Närpes* (Central Finland)
Bru:ka **ni itt** springg åm voå:ran åp i:sfla:tjen å tå i:sin rie:kt?
use you not run in spring.the on ice.floe.the and when ice.the brakes
(Ivars 1988:156)

b. *Närpes* (Central Finland)
He va no: na veldigt fi:nt, såm **an int** glyö:mar na fo:rt
it was MOD something very nice, which he not forget so quickly
(Ivars 1988: 180)

c. *Nyland* (Southern Finland)
O när an int for foder, so for **an int** spillning (Lundström 1939: 153)
And when he not get food, then get he not stool

d. *Älvdalen* (Central Sweden)
og tror **du int** meg (Levander 1909)
and believes you not me

e. *Tromsø* (Northern Norway)
at **han ikkje** slog sæ fordærva (Iversen 1918: 83)
that he not hurt himself to.death

f. *Salten* (Northern Norway)
de' villj **e ittje/itj** ha te kjærring (Brekke 2000:160)
you want I not have to wife

[2] Nordfjord, Sunnmøre, Bergen (Venås 1971).

g. han sa **han ITTE** ha vóre der (Heggstad 1920: 84)
he said (that) he not has been there

h. *Kristiansand* (Southern Norway)
Kan **du'ke** se'? (Johnsen 1942: 162f)
can you.not.cl. see

i. *Setesdal* (Southern Mid-Norway)
Itt **du inkji** vi me de goe, so lyt du me de vonde
if you not want with the good, then must you with the bad
*Itt **inkji du** vi me de goe, so lyt du me de vonde
(Helga Bjørkeli, p.c.)

2.3 *Pattern 2*

(6) *Oppdal* (Central Norway)[3]
a. Da ha **ittj e** sakt ta dær (Haugen 1982: 155)
that have not I said that there
b. Kol'les ha dæ vårte, dær'såm **åss ittj** ha haft slike
how had it been, if we not had had such

(7) *Norrland* (Sweden)
a. ska**-nt-u** jöra de? (Bucht 1970: 66)
shall-not.cl-you.cl do it
b. Ha-**nt** **du** hôrt tal? (Dahlstedt & Ågren 1954: 279)
have-not.cl you heard spoken

2.3.1 An analysis of cliticization

❖ The clitic negation is generated in Neg^0, and it moves along with the verb (cf. Zeijlstra 2004)

2.3.2 Verb movement across weak negation

(8) *Älvdal* (Sweden)
a. John aunggrer at **an (*it)** ar **it** tajdh examen (Wiklund 2006: 1)
John regrets that he not has not taken exam.the
b. John augnrer att **an int** ar **(*int)** tajdh examen (Wiklund 2006: 1)

(9) *Setesdal* (South Norway)
a. Itt **du** vi **kji** me de goe, so lyt du me de vonde
if you want not with the good, then must you with the bad
(Heggstad 1916: 165)

[3] Cf. Endresen 1988.

b. Itt **du inkji** vi (***inkji**) me de goe, so lyt du me de vonde (Helga Bjørkeli, p.c.)

(10) *Eastern Norwegian*

a. Han sa han ha **itte** vóre der
he said (that) he has not been there

b. han sa han **ITTE** ha vóre der (Heggstad 1920: 84)
he said (that) he not has been there

❖ The weak negation is in Neg^0, and "attracts" the verb in order to get a host.
❖ V cannot move to Fin in embedded clauses, because it should then in principle be able to move across the strong negation in [Spec,NegP].

❖ Assuming cliticization, why cannot negation attach to the verb when the (non-topicalised) subject is a pronoun?

(11) *Setesdal*

a. I går køyrde-**kje** **Ola (*inkje)** stokkan
yesterday drove-not.cl Ola not timber.the

b. I går køyrde **(*kje)** **han inkje** stokkan
yesterday drove-not.cl he not timber.the (Helga Bjørkeli, p.c.)

❖ Christensen's analysis can not immediately account for these observations.

2.4 Garbacz 2006

❖ An analysis of negation based on the dialect of Älvdalen.
❖ Negation is base-generated in Neg_1P.
❖ Whether Neg_2P is projected or not, is subject to variation across the Scandinavian languages. Negation may move to Neg_2P.

(12) $[_{CP}\ [_{NegP2}\ Neg_2^0\ [_{AgrSP}$ **subject** $AgrS^0\ [TP\ T^0\ [_{NegP1}$ **negation** $Neg_1^0\ [_{vP}\ V$

❖ This analysis can account for verb movement (to T/AgrS) across the lower negation in embedded clauses.

2.5 *Pattern 3*

❖ Pattern 3 does not automatically follow from (4) – in these dialects negation usually is high and precedes the subject. However, Garbacz' analysis (12) can easily account for these observations, assuming that negation usually moves to Neg_2P (cf. Pettersen 1973).

(13) a. *Nordfjord*
kan **ikkje** **eg** få det (Fitje 1995: 77)
can not I get it

b. *Bergen*
ska' **kje** **vi** skrive mer (Larsen&Stoltz 1912: 148)

shall not we write more

c. *Bergen*
han ba at **ikj eg** sku sæiæ de (Larsen&Stoltz 1912: 148)
he asked that not I should say it

d. *North-western Norway*
Høyr' **ikkje dé** (Venås 1971: 150)
Hear not you

2.6 *Pattern 4*

(14) *Stavanger* (South-Eastern Norway)
a. Darrfårr kan **eg ikkje** kåmma (Svendsen 1931: 136)
therefore can I not come
b. E **kje han** der lenger? (Svendsen 1931: 133)
is not he there any.longer
c. Han trur at hu veid **de ikkje** (Svendsen 1931: 139)
he thinks that she know it not
d. Endå di likte **de ikkje** (Svendsen 1931: 139)
even.though they liked it not
e. Han reiser åm **ikkje de** bler gått ver (Svendsen 1931: 139)
he leaves if not it becomes good whether
f. Ein stein så **ikkje han** såg (Svendsen 1931: 139)
a rock that not he saw

❖ There seems to be a lot of optionality in the dialect of Stavanger.
❖ According to Jensen (1995) the negation in Sjælland can follow the complementizer only when it is stressed ⇒ the dialect of Sjælland belongs to pattern 1(?). This is not mentioned in Pedersen (1996).

❖ Garbacz' analysis can also account for pattern 4, assuming optional movement of negation from Neg_1P to Neg_2P.

2.7 Movement of stressed negation

❖ In the dialect of Älvdalen negation moves to Neg_2P in embedded clauses when the negation has stress (p. 6). This also holds for the dialect of Oppdal (Haugen 1982):

(15) *Älvdal*
um **INT Alfred** edd apt skuogspäningga (Garbacz 2006: 2)
if not A. had had forest.money.the

(16) *Oppdal*
Minnj annjkannj no se mangt såmm **ITJ ann** a vija sakt au da.
but he can mod.prt. tell a.lot that not he has wanted said too then
(Haugen 1982: 149)

2.8 The scope of negation

2.8.1 Subject interpretations

- ❖ It is claimed that different subject interpretations are associated with different positions, and especially the difference between weak and strong interpretation has been discussed (Nilsen 1997; Svenonius 2002; Westergaard and Vangnes 2005(?); Bentzen 2005).
- ❖ Strong subjects precede negation, weak subjects follow negation (cf. Nilsen 1997).
- ❖ In the dialects of North-Western Norway negation precedes the (specific) pronouns. These data predict that negation also should be able to precede strong subjects in both main and embedded clauses. If this is borne out, negation is really high in these dialects. The same should hold for the dialects of Trøndelag in main clauses.

- ❖ Garbacz (2006) can account for this prediction, assuming strong subjects in AgrSP and weak subjects in vP. Christensen (2005) cannot, assuming strong subjects in FinP and weak subjects in TP.

2.8.2 Negation and modals

- ❖ Another issue is the observation that there are scope ambiguities between negation and modals (Eide 2002).

(17) a. Dermed kan ikke medisinen virke ¬ > ◊
thus can not medicine.the work
b. Dermed kan medisinen ikke virke ¬ > ◊ or ◊ > ¬

Garbacz (2006) cannot account for (17b), assuming that modals are generated outside vP, while Christensen (2005) can (if the subject sits in either TP or FinP).

3 Proposal: Three possible positions for negation

- ❖ A combination of Christensen (2005) and Garbacz (2006)

Premises:
- ❖ Subject positions are fixed ([Spec,AgrSP] strong; [Spec,TP] weak), pronouns are interpreted as strong, and sit in [Spec,AgrSP]
- ❖ Neg_1P has narrow scope (cf. Christensen 2005); Neg_2P and Neg_3P have wide scope
- ❖ The presence or absence of any of Neg_2P and Neg_3P are subject to micro-variation (dialects and clause types)

(18) $[_{CP}\ [_{Neg3P}\ Neg_3^{\ 0}\ [_{AgrSP}$ **strong subject** $AgrS^0\ [_{Neg2P}\ Neg_2^{\ 0}$ [TP **weak subject** $T^0\ [_{Neg1P}$ $Neg_1^{\ 0}\ [_{vP}$ V

Pattern 1: Neg_3P is generally not present, i.e. Christensen's (2005) analysis

Pattern 2: (i) Either Neg_3P is generally not present if one assumes that negation is a clitic in main clauses, (ii) or Neg_2P is generally not present in main clauses, while Neg_3P is generally not present in embedded clauses

Pattern 3: Neg_3P is the preferred position for the negation in every clause type

Pattern 4: Neg_2P and Neg_3P are optionally present

Verb movement across weak negation: V-to-T movement across Neg_1P (cf. Garbacz 2006)

Problems/questions:

- How does Neg_1P scope over auxiliaries when there is V-to-T movement in embedded clauses?
- Are there fixed subject positions?
- Weak negation – clitics or not?

4 Summary

- ❖ I have give an overview of the distribution of negation in some dialects, and related it to two issues regarding the scope of negation.
- ❖ Based on the available data three possible positions for negation in the TP-domain have been proposed.

References

Bentzen, Kristine. 2005. What's the better move? On verb placement in Standard and Northern Norwegian. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 28:153-188.

Brekke, Olga, Sandøy, Helge, and Rundhovde, Gunnvor. 2000. *Saltendialekten : en grammatikk*. Fauske: Skjerstad og Fauske bygdeboknemd.

Bucht, Torsten. 1962. *Språket i Härnösand*: Skrifter / Nämnden før svensk språkvård ; 25. Stockholm: Norstedts.

Christensen, Ken Ramshøj. 2005. Interfaces. Negation - Syntax - Brain, The Department of English, The MR Research Centre, Aashus University Hospital, University of Aarhus.

Eide, Kristin M. 2002. Adjuntion Sites for Negation in Norwegian: Modals and Negation. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 25:225-252.

Endresen, Øyalf. 1988. Innbyrdes posisjon mellom trykklett pronomen og setningsadverbialet *ikkje* i trøndske og nordsvenske dialekter. In *Nordiske studiar*, eds. Andreas Bjørkum and Arve Borg, 47-70. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Fitje, Audun. 1995. *Målføret i Gloppen*: Norske studiar ; 7. [Sandane]: [A. Fitje].

Garbacz, Piotr. 2006. Negationen i älvdalskan. In *Grammatik i Fokus*. Lund.

Haugen, Einar. 1982. *Oppdalsmålet : innføring i et sørtrøndsk fjellbygdmål*. Oslo: Tanum-Norli.

Heggstad, Leiv. 1916. Ymist or syntaksen i Sæbyggjemaalet. *Maal og minne*:159-166.

Heggstad, Leiv. 1920. Um ordleiding og setningsbygning i norske maalføre. *Maal og minne*:81-93.

Holmberg, Anders, and Platzack, Christer. to appear. The Scandinavian Languages. In *The Comparative Syntax Handbook*, eds. Guglielmo Cinque and Richard Kayne.

Ivars, Ann-Marie. 1988. *Närpesdialekten på 1980-talet*: Studier i nordisk filologi ; 70. Helsingfors.

Jensen, Eva Skafte. 1995. Neksusadverbialets placering i ledsætninger. *NyS* 20:77-90.

Johnsen, Arnulf. 1942. *Kristiansands bymål*. Oslo: Aschehoug.

Johnsen, Arnulf. 1962. *Syntaksen i Kristiansands bymål*. Oslo: Aschehoug.

Larsen, Amund B., and Stoltz, Gerhard. 1912. *Bergens bymål*. Kristiania: i kommisjon hos Aschehoug.

Levander, Lars. 1909. *Ælvdalsmålet i Dalarna : ordbøjning och syntax*. Stockholm: Norstedt.

Lundström, Gudrun. 1939. *Studier i nyländsk syntax*. Stockhom: Norstedt.

Nilsen, Øystein. 1997. Adverbs and A-shift. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 59:1-31.

Pedersen, Inge Lise. 1996. 'Der kan jo være nogen der kan itte tåle det' Om hovedsætningsordstilling i bisætninger i danske dialekter. In *Studier i Talesprogsvariation og Sprogkontakt. Til Inger Eskjær på halvfjerdsårsdagen den 20 maj 1996*, eds. B. Nielsen and Inge Lise Pedersen, 242-251. København: C. A. Reitzels Forlag.

Pettersen, Egil. 1973. Neksusadverbialet *ikke* i Bergens bymål. *Maal og minne*:44-52.

Svendsen, Martin. 1931. *Syntaksen i Stavanger bymål*. Oslo: Aschehoug.

Svenonius, Peter. 2002. Subject positions and the placement of adverbials. In *Subjects, expleitves, and the EPP*, ed. Peter Svenonius, 201-242. New York: Oxford University Press.

Venås, Kjell. 1971. Om posisjonen til neksusadverbialet *ikkje*. *Maal og minne*:124-173.

Westergaard, Marit R., and Vangsnes, Øystein A. 2005. Wh-Questions, V2, and the Left Periphery of Three Norwegian Dialect Types [1-2]. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 8:117-158.

Wiklund, Anna-Lena (2006) *A note on the correlation between verb movement and rich inflection. New data from Älvdalsmålet.* ms, University of Tromsø.

Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2004. Sentential Negation and Negative Concord, Meertens instituut, Amsterdam.

Appendix

Dialect	clausetype	neg-N	neg-n	neg.cl-n	NEG-n	v-movem across neg	O.S
Finnish-swedish	Declarative		–				
	yes/no-q.		–				
	embedded		–				
	if-clause		✓				
Älvdalen	Declarative		–				–
	yes/no-q.		–				
	embedded		–		✓	✓	
Härnösand	Declarative		–	✓			
	yes/no-q.	–	✓				
Ö Norrland	yes/no-q.		✓				
Northern Norwegian	Declarative	✓	–	–			✓
	yes/no-q.	✓	–	–			
	embedded	✓	–	–			
	if-clause		✓				
Trøndelag (Oppdal)	Declarative	✓	✓				(✓)
	embedded		–		✓		
Eastern Norwegian	Declarative		–	✓			✓
	yes/no-q		–	✓			
	embedded		–	–		(✓)	
North-W. No and Bergen	Declarative	✓	✓	✓		–	–
	yes/no-q	✓	✓	✓			
	embedded	✓	✓	✓			
Stavanger	Declarative		(✓)	✓			(✓)
	yes/no-q		✓	✓			
	that-clause	✓				✓	
	embedded I					✓	
	embedded II	✓	✓	✓	–	–	
Southern Norwegian	yes/no-q	✓	–	–			✓
	embedded	✓	–	–			
Setesdal	Decl	✓	–	–			
	embedded	–	–	–		✓	
Sjælland	embedded	✓	✓		✓		✓

n=pronominal subject
N=non-pronominal subject
neg=negation
NEG=stressed negasjon
O.S=object shift
neg.cl=clitic negation
✓: the patterns in row one are okay in the dialect
– : the patterns in row one are not okay in the dialect