



Jan Terje Faarlund: *The Syntax of Mainland Scandinavian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019. 330 pp.

With the publication of this book, Jan Terje Faarlund, professor emeritus of Scandinavian Linguistics at the University of Oslo, makes a comparative overview of Danish, Norwegian and Swedish available to linguists who are unable to read these languages. I believe this is the first book of its kind. To find a similar attempt we have to go back to the 1940s when Lage Hulthén published his comprehensive comparison of the syntax of Nordic languages, see Hulthén (1944, 1947). Hulthén's study is however written in Swedish and is based on written sources mainly from the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th. The main sources for Faarlund's book are the three reference grammars published in Norwegian, Swedish and Danish between 1997 and 2011: *Norsk referansegrammatikk* (Faarlund, Lie & Vannebo, 1997, abbreviated NRG), *Svenska Akademiens grammatik* (Teleman, Hellberg & Andersson 1999, abbreviated SAG) and *Grammatik over det Danske Sprog* (Hansen & Heltoft 2011, abbreviated GDS). These grammars are accessible to linguists who speak any one of the described languages, whereas the primary intended readership for Faarlund's new book is presumably the linguistic community outside Scandinavia. This is also the reason why this review is written in English.

In the Preface, Faarlund states that “the object language of this book is Mainland Scandinavian, considered as one language” and that the book

will present a synthesis of the shared features across Scandinavia, as well as what is specific to each standard variety. [...] Although there are differences in phonology, grammar and lexicon, which sometimes may present a challenge to inter-Scandinavian communication, the Mainland Scandinavian languages should be treated linguistically as one language.” (p. 2)

The differences that exist are mainly found in phonology, inflectional morphology and orthography. Faarlund concentrates on the standard languages but occasionally discusses non-standard varieties that represent interesting syntactic phenomena. The theoretical background for the book is given as ‘minimalism’, without further specification, and this is also used as the descriptive framework. A short overview of central syntactic notions, such as the distinction between *lexical* and *functional* categories and the operations *merge* and *adjoin*, is given (pp. 3–5). Faarlund seems to presuppose that the reader is already familiar with this ‘average’ minimalism, or knows where to find a suitable introduction. The

clause is divided into three layers, or ‘domains’, where the lowest layer is the VP, the lexical domain. Above the VP we find the grammatical domain, the TP, where tense, mood, voice and other functional grammatical features appear. Elements in the highest domain, CP, determine how the sentence can be used in context. This division is reflected in the organization of the book which starts with chapters on the lexical phrases, followed by the grammatical TP domain and the contextual CP domain. Finally, anaphoric binding, conjunction and ellipsis are dealt with in separate chapters.

Data presentation

The examples in the book are taken from the reference grammars NRG, SAG and GDS, mentioned above, from specific publications or from the internet. In the case of Norwegian, the author has sometimes constructed examples. Only very rarely is the source of an example indicated and then mainly when it comes from a research publication dealing with the phenomenon under discussion. This is unfortunate as this makes it harder to assess the representativeness of the chosen examples and to look up further details e.g. concerning agreement. In this respect, Hulthén’s work is more informative since he always gives the page of the relevant grammar, novel or newspaper from where an example is taken, using abbreviations. For most phenomena, Faarlund gives examples from all the three standard languages, abbreviated D, N and S. Sometimes he distinguishes the two written Norwegian standards; Norwegian *bokmål* *Nb*, the variety that has developed from the written Danish that was used as the official language in Norway during the 15th to 19th centuries, and Norwegian *nynorsk* *Nn*, the written standard based on the Norwegian dialects that were less affected by Danish (p. 2). In (1) I give an example of the way the data are presented (see p. 21ff.). The first column shows a bare definite noun and the second a noun modified by an adjective. I follow Faarlund’s glossing. Common gender is glossed as CG and neuter as N.

- | | | |
|-------|------------------------------------|--|
| (1) D | drenge
boy.DEF
‘the boy’ | den store dreng
the.CG big boy
‘the big boy’ |
| Nb | barnet
child.DEF
‘the child’ | det lille barnet
the.N little child.DEF
‘the little child’ |

S	flickorna	de unga flickorna
	girls.DEF	the.PL unga girls.DEF
	'the girls'	'the young girls'

As can be seen in the first column, all three languages mark definiteness on the noun. Faarlund accounts for this by assuming that the noun moves to the head of the Determiner phrase D where it lexicalizes the definiteness feature. This is in line with previous research by e.g. Delsing (1993) and Julien (2005). When a definite noun is preceded by a modifier, as in the second column, this movement is somehow blocked in Norwegian and Swedish and we get the so called 'double definiteness' marking on both the determiner and the noun. In Danish there is no definiteness marking on the noun. Faarlund suggests that this difference follows from a difference in where the definiteness feature is merged (in an intermediate functional projection in Norwegian and Swedish, only in D in Danish). The accompanying tree diagrams are clear enough but the account seems rather stipulative.

The glossing of the examples is minimal and often limited to the feature under discussion. This means that information about the gender of a noun often is not given, which is unfortunate since this is an area where the languages vary. Danish and Swedish use a two-gender system, neuter versus common gender. In Norwegian *nynorsk* and in most Norwegian dialects there are three genders, masculine, feminine and neuter. Norwegian *bokmål* speakers vary between two and three genders (p. 8). When there are morphological differences between the two Norwegian varieties, both varieties are shown, for instance in chapter 2 on nominals and in chapter 3 on adjectives. In later chapters, often just one example from one of the varieties is given.

Adjectives agree with the nouns they modify in gender and number. About the 'weak' form of the adjective, which is used in definite noun phrases, Faarlund writes that it ends in *-e* in Danish and Norwegian and in *-a/e* in Swedish and that it lacks gender or number distinctions (p. 14). This is correct as far as grammatical gender is concerned, but hides another difference between the languages. In contemporary Swedish, the choice between the endings *-a/e* has come to signal the sex of a common gender referent, as illustrated in (2) (SAG 2: 227ff.). Examples supplied by me are marked (EE).

- (2) S a. den lilla flickan (EE)
 the.CG little girl
- b. den lille pojken
 the.CG little boy
- c. det lilla barnet
 the.N little child
- d. *det lille barnet

For neuter nouns, only the *-a* ending can be used; (2c) is hence used for children of both sexes.

The chapters on the verb phrase (chapter 5), the finite clause (chapter 6), the independent sentence (chapter 7) and subordinate clauses (chapter 8) make up the bulk of the book, around 200 pages, and cover a number of interesting constructions. Rather than enumerating all of these, I have here chosen to discuss a few in somewhat more detail.

Argument structure, small clauses and presentational sentences

In discussing the verb phrase, Faarlund relies both on purely syntactic criteria and on criteria having to do with argument roles such as unaccusativity. There are *transitive* verbs which require a complement, like *finne* ‘find’, and *intransitive* verbs “that can never take a complement” (p. 82). As an example of an intransitive verb, Faarlund gives the verb *arbeta* ‘work’ and the examples in (3a,b).

- (3) S a. Per arbetade.
 Per worked
- b. *Per arbetade middag.
 Per worked dinner
- c. Per arbetade på avhandlingen. (EE)
 Per worked on dissertation.DEF

He does not discuss (3c) in this context. It turns out that Faarlund assumes that an intransitive verb can never take a *nominal* complement.¹ Hence *arbeta* is intransitive despite the fact that it can take a PP complement as in (3c). Evidence

1. This definition is not found in the book but in NRG (1997: 663ff.)

that this PP is an argument, and not an adjunct, comes from the fact that it has to be included in VP-pronominalization when the VP is replaced by the neuter pronoun *det* (4a) and that it cannot be added as an adjunct (4b) (see p. 43).

- (4) S a. Per arbetade på avhandlingen. Det gjorde han varje dag. (EE)
 Per worked on dissertation.DEF it did he every day
 ‘Per was working on the dissertation. He did so every day.’
- b. Per arbetade. *Det gjorde han på avhandlingen.
 Per worked it did he on dissertation.DEF

Faarlund refers to PP complements as *prepositional objects* (p. 106ff.) and also restricts the use of *object* to nominal complements.

An innovative and interesting proposal in this book is that practically all types of verbs are analyzed as taking small clause (SC) complements (see pp. 109–139). This applies to copula verbs, transitive verbs, intransitive and unaccusative verbs. (5) gives an example with a copula taking a prepositional SC complement (from p. 130). The SC subject *en bog* ‘a book’ can either stay in situ (5a), in which case the expletive *der* is inserted in Spec,TP, or raise to Spec,TP and subsequently to Spec,CP, as shown in (5b). Faarlund here changes the example to the definite *bogen* ‘the book’, without commenting. The reason is presumably that it is quite marked in Danish to start a sentence with an indefinite subject (see GDS 2011: 31). (5d) shows the assumed structure of the VP.

- (5) D a. Der er en bog på bordet.
 EXPL is a book on table.DEF
 ‘There is a book on the table.’
- b. Bogen er på bordet.
 book.DEF is on table.DEF
- c. *Der er bogen på bordet.
 EXPL is book.DEF on table.DEF
- d. [_{VP} e_r [_{PP} [_{DP} en bog] [_{P'} [_P på] [_{DP} bordet]]]]

Definite arguments are obligatorily raised to the subject position (in TP), as shown by the ungrammatical (5c). In order to account for this, Faarlund appeals to what he calls the “indefiniteness constraint”. “An expletive cannot cooccur with a definite internal argument” (p. 84). The reason Faarlund formulates this

as a constraint on the internal argument seems to be that he assumes that SC subjects are raised to the object position, thereby becoming internal arguments of the embedding verb (p. 109).

Essentially the same structure with a prepositional SC is assumed for unaccusative verbs of position and motion, like *ligge* ‘lie’, as well as for transitive verbs, like *lægge* ‘put’.

- (6) D a. Der ligger en bog på bordet.
 EXPL lies a book on table.DEF
 ‘There is a book on the table.’
- b. Bogen ligger på bordet.
 book.DEF lies on table.DEF
- c. [_{VP} ligger [_{PP} [_{DP} en bog] [_{P'} [_P på] [_{DP} bordet]]]]
- (7) D a. Hun lægger en bog på bordet.
 she puts a book on table.DEF
- b. [_{VP} hun [_{V'} lægger [_{PP} en bog [_{P'} [_P på] [_{DP} bordet]]]]]]
- c. *Der lægger hun en bog på bordet.
 EXPL puts she a book on table.DEF

A presentational version with an expletive is not possible with transitive verbs, (7c).² Faarlund does not discuss the reason for this. However, he assumes, presumably following Platzack (1983), that the expletive is merged in Spec,VP and this would exclude another external argument, as in (7b) (see e.g. example (10), p. 112). But for intransitive verbs, the possibility of an adverbial SC complement analysis as in (6c) is quite attractive and rhymes well with the fact that they are often used in presentational constructions. One possible weakness of the analysis is that there is no syntactic evidence that the SC behaves as a unit; Faarlund calls this “an unexpected fact” (p. 110). The small clause cannot raise to become a subject (8a) or be preposed (8b). The SC subject on the other hand can both raise to subject (8c) and be preposed (8d).

2. ‘This example is grammatical if the initial *der* is interpreted as a locative adverbial, but not if *der* is expletive. The ungrammaticality is seen more clearly in Norwegian and Swedish, where the expletive *det* is used.

(i) S *Det lægger hon en bok på bordet.
 EXPL puts she a book on table.DEF

- (8) D a. *[_{PP} En bog på bordet] ligger.
a book on table.DEF lies
- b. *[_{PP} En bog på bordet] ligger der.
a book on table.DEF lies EXPL
- c. Hvad_i ligger [_{TP} e_i [_{VP} [_{PP} e_i [_{P'} på bordet]]]]?
what lies on table.DEF
'What is on the table?'
- d. Hvad_i ligger [_{TP} der [_{VP} [_{PP} e_i [_{P'} på bordet]]]]?
what lies EXPL on table.DEF
'What is there on the table?'

This might indicate that the SC subject is first raised (string vacuously) to become the object of the verb, as Faarlund assumes, although it is not clear if both the object and the SC should count as internal arguments of the verb.³

Additional support for the SC analysis, not discussed in the book, comes from looking at verbs that take prepositional objects such as *lita på* 'rely on, trust'. The preposition *på* 'on' is here required by the verb and does not have its normal locative meaning. Hence it doesn't make sense to analyse it as the head of a SC PP, unlike the examples shown in (6) and (7). Consequently there is no low position for the subject and a presentational construction is correctly predicted to be ungrammatical.

- (9) S a. Många människor litar på sitt minne. (EE)
many people rely on REFL.POSS memory
'Many people rely on their memory.'
- b. *Det litar många människor på sitt minne.
EXPL rely many people on REFL.POSS memory

The small clause analysis works less well for Swedish particle verbs since it predicts that the SC subject should precede the particle head (p. 137ff.). This is the order found in Danish, but in Swedish, the particle always precedes the nominal and in Norwegian there is quite a lot of variation. Faarlund's solution to this is to assume that in these cases, the particle is right-adjoined to V, but he doesn't explain how this can apply to the head of a small clause.

3. The dual nature of the indefinite DP – as a subject of the SC and as an object of the higher verb – seems to fit with the split behaviour of pivots discussed in Zaenen et al. (2017) and Engdahl et al. (2018).

Pancake sentences

Predicate adjectives are also analyzed as small clauses with agreement between the small clause subject and the head (p. 117ff.). Clausal subjects take neuter agreement (10a) and this is also the case with certain common gender nouns, as shown in (10b). This type is often referred to as pancake sentences (see Enger 2004).

- (10) S a. Att studera grammatik är roligt.
 to study grammar is fun.N
 ‘To study grammar is fun.’
- b. Grammatik är roligt.
 grammar.CG is fun.N

Faarlund suggests that in these cases “the subject can be analyzed as a clause with a verb in the infinitive, and the overt subject as the object of that verb” (p. 117).⁴ He concludes that the analysis “predicts that only adjectives that may semantically be predicated of propositions can occur with this agreement pattern.” However, this generalization is not quite true; the neuter agreement pattern can be used also with e.g. colour adjectives. SAG (3: 182) gives the example in (11a) to illustrate that a bare DP with weak reference takes neuter agreement. Similar examples are found in Norwegian.

- (11) S a. Senap är gult. (SAG 3:182)
 mustard.CG is yellow.N
- N b. Halm er gult. (Enger 2004:14)
 straw.M.SG is yellow.N.SG
- S c. #Att ha senap är gult. (Josefsson 2006: 39)
 to have mustard is yellow.N

Attempts to paraphrase such subjects with infinitival phrases leads to nonsense, as shown in (11c).⁵ Most of the observations in this section are repeated in the section about the form of subjects on p. 158ff.

4. This is essentially the transformational analysis proposed in Faarlund (1977). He does not say anything about how this can be captured in the current framework.

5. Josefsson (2006) distinguishes two constructions, one propositional as in (i), and one nominal, as in (ii). Only the propositional construction allows for attributive adjectives.

(i) Svensk grammatik är roligt.
 Swedish grammar.CG is fun.N

The middle field: Subject shift, Object shift and Negative shift

As mentioned above, Faarlund uses a minimalist description with binary branching at all levels, including the TP. The cited reference grammars on the other hand follow the Scandinavian topological grammar tradition from Diderichsen (1947) and use a rather flat structure divided into fields. The part of the clause between C and VP is referred to as the *middle field*. One challenge for both binary and flat descriptions is the large amount of word order variation found in this domain. Faarlund discusses the grammatical consequences of this variation on pp. 194–205. Whereas it is common to assume that sentence adverbials are left-adjoined to VP, as Faarlund does on p.194, this doesn't account for the variation shown in (12) (p. 195f.).

- (12) S
- a. Nu är visst Johan arg på mig.
now is MP Johan angry on me
'Now Johan seems to be angry with me.'
 - b. Nu är han visst arg på mig.
now is he MP angry on me
'Now he seems to be angry with me.'
 - c. *Nu är visst han arg på mig.
now is MP he angry on me
 - d. Nu är Johan visst arg på mig.
now is Johan MP angry on me
'Now Johan seems to be angry with me.'

In Norwegian and Swedish, but not in Danish, lexical subjects often follow a sentence adverbial, whereas unstressed pronouns have to precede the adverbial. This could be accounted for by assuming two adverbial positions, one left adjoined to TP and one left adjoined to VP.⁶ But, Faarlund writes, “generating adverbials in different positions depending on the form of the subject seems poorly motivated” (p. 196). He assumes instead that the adverbials in both (12a) and (12b) are generated in the higher position and that the word order in (12b) is “the result of a rule of *subject shift*, whereby an unstressed subject pronoun

(ii) *Fransk senap är gult.
French mustard.CG is yellow.N

6. The word order schemas in NRG have two different adverbial positions (1997: 859ff.). A different approach is taken by Börjars et al. (2003) who employ Optimality Theory constraints reflecting information structure and scope to achieve the attested orders in Swedish.

moves past the adjoining adverb and adjoins to the left of it, very much parallel to object shift”. But unlike *object shift*, which shifts a pronoun across a sentential adverb and only applies to unstressed pronouns, subject shift must presumably also apply to lexical DPs, since (12d) is grammatical. In the rest of this chapter, Faarlund however seems to revert to the idea that sentence adverbials are adjoined low, to the VP. This leads to some unclarities.

There is an interesting interaction between object shift and the realization of negation. Without going into details of how negative incorporation comes about, Faarlund writes that “[n]egated objects (direct or indirect) follow the finite verb in main clauses, in the position of negation” (p. 203).⁷

- (13) Nb a. Jeg sa ingenting.
I said nothing
- b. *Jeg gav broren min ingen gave.
I gave brother my no present
Intended: ‘I did not give my brother any present.’
- c. Jeg gav ikke broren min noen gave.
I gave not brother my any present
‘I did not give my brother any present.’
- d. Jeg gav henne ingen gave.
I gave her no present

In (13a) the negation *ikke* and an indefinite object have ‘coalesced’ into the negative quantifier *ingenting* ‘nothing’. This is not possible in (13b) where an indirect object intervenes. Instead the negation and the quantifier are realized separately, as in (13c). (13d) is however grammatical and Faarlund’s explanation for this is that the pronoun *henne* in (13d) has undergone object shift, presumably before the negation is incorporated into the direct object. The lexical DP *broren min* in (13c) cannot shift and hence blocks the incorporation of the negation. Similarly, in subordinate clauses, where the verb doesn’t raise but remains in the VP, it blocks the negative incorporation, as shown in (14a).

7. This quote also illustrates that the author sometimes uses the topological description language from NRG also in this book.

- (14) S a. *om du sa ingenting
if you said nothing
- b. om du inte sa någonting
if you not said anything
'if you didn't say anything'

In addition to the pattern in (14b), without incorporation, Danish and Swedish have the option of moving an indefinite object out of the VP in which case the negation has to be incorporated.

- (15) D a. Han har måske ingenting fået.
he has maybe nothing received
'He has perhaps received nothing.'
- S b. om du ingenting sa
if you nothing said
'if you said nothing'
- N c. ?om du ingenting sa
if you nothing said

Preverbal negated objects are presumably a remnant from earlier stages when objects could precede the verb. They are considered standard in Danish and are still used relatively frequently in Swedish, as shown in Engels (2012). In Norwegian they are apparently quite marked, and this may have led Faarlund to assign question marks also to the Danish and Swedish examples (p. 204). In this context it is worth noting that examples like (16) are quite common.

- (16) S Ingen information har de fått.
no information have they received

Here an object with incorporated negation has been preposed from a VP with a non-finite V. This type was first discussed in Christensen (1986).

Even if Faarlund gives a fairly comprehensive overview of the main facts concerning (possible) subject shift, object shift and negative shift, as they have been described in the literature, there is actually a lot more variation, both within the individual languages and between the languages. Up until now it has been difficult to get enough data to study this variation, but recently a new resource has become available, the *Nordic Word Order Database* (Lundquist et al.

2019).⁸ This database consists of elicited production data, approximately 55 000 sentences produced by more than 250 speakers from Denmark, Norway and Sweden as well as from the Faroe Islands and Iceland.

Constraints and ‘syntactic islands’

As mentioned earlier, Faarlund employs an ‘average minimalism’ as his descriptive framework, but occasionally he makes comments like “in violation of a basic principle of Scandinavian syntax” (p. 172) when he reasons about the ungrammaticality of some sentences. This basic principle is also referred to as the “obligatory subject requirement” in several places but he does not spell it out, nor does he make any attempts to account for this basic principle in his minimalist framework, or give references to other relevant work. One constraint that is mentioned in several chapters is the ban on clausal subjects in Spec,TP, which Faarlund takes to be “the basic subject position” (p. 156). Consider the following examples from p. 160f.

- (17) Nn a. [CP At dei ikkje forstår problemet]_i er [TP e_i oplagt for alle].
 C they not understand problem.DEF is obvious.N for all
 ‘That they do not understand the problem is obvious to everybody.’
- b. Derfor er [TP det_i oplagt for alle] [CP at dei ikkje forstår problemet]_i.
 therefore is it obvious.N for all C they not understand problem.DEF
 ‘It is obvious to everybody that they do not understand the problem.’
- c. *Derfor er [TP [CP at dei ikkje forstår problemet]] oplagt for alle.
 therefore is C they not understand problem.DEF obvious.N for all

In (14a), the clausal subject has been preposed to Spec,CP and in (14b) it has been extraposed, leaving an expletive *det* in Spec,TP. Both of these are grammatical whereas (14c), where the clause is in Spec,TP, is judged to be ungrammatical. The same pattern is found with non-finite clauses, as shown in (18).

- (18) S a. [Att äta grönsaker]_i ska [TP e_i vara sunt].
 IM eat vegetables shall be healthy.N
 ‘To eat vegetables is supposed to be healthy.’
- b. Därför ska [TP det_i vara sunt] [att äta grönsaker]_i.
 therefore shall it be healthy.N IM eat vegetables
 ‘Therefore it is supposed to be healthy to eat vegetables.’

8. This article also contains a useful overview of previous research on the word order variation and thus complements the rather sparse references in Faarlund’s book.

- c. *Därför ska [TP [att äta grönsaker] vara sunt].
 therefore shall IM eat vegetables be healthy.N

In chapter 8 we find the heading ‘Syntactic islands’ (p. 278). Faarlund here writes that “clausal subjects are islands”, but he presumably means that clausal subjects in Spec,TP are islands; extraction from an extraposed clausal subject is fine, see (19b).

- (19) S a. *Grönsaker_j ska [TP [att äta _j] vara sunt].
 vegetables shall IM eat be healthy.N
 b. Grönsaker_j ska [TP det_i vara sunt] [att äta _j].
 vegetables shall it be healthy.N IM eat

That (19a) is ungrammatical is hence not surprising since we already know that clausal subjects in Spec,TP are avoided.

Another island is introduced by the following statement: “Complement clauses with main clause word order are islands” (p. 278). This is illustrated with one example but there is no discussion of why this is the case. Embedded clauses with main clause word order, i.e. with verb movement to C, are discussed briefly on p. 241f., as instances of recursive CPs. In the *Further reading* section to that chapter we find several references to discussions of embedded V2 but there is no mention of Sten Vikner’s recent proposal to distinguish CPs with a finite verb in C from CPs headed by a complementizer which ties in nicely with extraction possibilities (see Vikner 2017 and Nyvad et al. 2017).

The third proposed syntactic island is stated as follows: “Clauses functioning as predicate complements are also islands” (p. 279), see the example in (20). In (20a) the clause is a complement to *vara* ‘be’; the subject *meningen* ‘the point’ has been preposed to Spec,CP.

- (20) S a. Meningen kan inte vara [att vi ska tjäna stora pengar]. (EE)
 point.DEF can not be C we shall earn big money
 ‘The point can’t be that we will make big money.’
 b. *Stora pengar_j kan meningen inte vara [att vi ska tjäna _j].
 big money can point.DEF not be C we shall earn

This is an interesting observation which I have not seen discussed elsewhere.⁹ It does not follow from the ban on extraction from clausal subjects. However it is not clear that the clause is a predicate complement. It seems better to analyze this as an equative construction where *vara* expresses identity, not predication, as Faarlund himself suggests on p. 121. We can compare (20) with the alternative in (21) where the clause is the subject. This can appear either in Spec,CP (21a) or as extraposed, (21b).

- (21) S a. [Att vi ska tjäna stora pengar] kan inte vara meningen. (EE)
 C we shall earn big money can not be point.DEF
 ‘That we will make big money can’t be the point.’
- b. Det_i kan inte vara meningen [att vi ska tjäna stora pengar]_i.
 it can not be point.DEF C we shall earn big money
 ‘It can’t be the point that we will make big money.’
- c. Stora pengar_j kan det_i inte vara meningen [att vi ska tjäna]_i.
 big money can it not be point.DEF C we shall earn
 ‘It can’t be the point that we will make big MONEY.’

Extraction from the extraposed subject clause in (21c) is grammatical and examples like this are found in spontaneous speech, often with a preposed object pronoun (Engdahl & Lindahl 2014).

- (22) S Det_j var det inte meningen att du skulle höra _j. (EE)
 it was it not point.DEF C you should hear
 ‘You were not supposed to hear that.’

I suspect that the contrast between the ungrammatical (20b) and the grammatical (21c) and (22) have to do with information structure.

Other comments

This book gives a comprehensive overview of Scandinavian phrase and clause structure. For the most part, Faarlund gives a plain presentation of the facts, using examples from all three languages. Sometimes he gives a brief summary of relevant theoretical issues in footnotes, for example on the reasons for double

9. Faarlund’s Danish example has the purported subject *pointen* ‘point’ following the negation. Since this is not possible in Danish (see p. 195f.), it might be that this example should be analyzed as involving an extraposed clausal subject, without the expected expletive *det*.

definiteness in Norwegian and Swedish (p. 22), on the position of external arguments in AP (p. 62) and on the definition of small clause (p. 109). There is a, perhaps unavoidable, bias towards the areas of grammar that he has worked on himself, as shown in the *Further readings* sections at the end of each chapter. These contain a relatively small number of references and interested readers will hopefully consult the bibliographies in these works to find other relevant works.

Throughout the book there are several useful bits of information. On p. 27, Faarlund notes that although the definite article *den* and the demonstrative pronoun *den* are homographs, they are pronounced differently. The article is pronounced with a reduced vowel whereas the demonstrative has a full vowel. This is linked to the tendency for articles to be unstressed and for demonstratives to carry stress. When introducing a phrase type, Faarlund first describes the common pattern and then notes systematic differences. In a few places he finds differences where there are none. One example of this is in the section on small clauses following verbs of ordering and request where he claims that *D bede*, *NS be* ‘ask, tell (somebody to do something)’, takes a verbal small clause in Danish and Norwegian, with a bare infinitive (p. 113), but a control infinitive in Swedish. The Swedish example provided, (24), has an optional preposition followed by an infinitive marker, which according to Faarlund means that it is ‘a control infinitive governed by a preposition’.

(23) D Han bad hende blive.
 he asked her stay
 ‘He asked her to stay.’

(24) S Vi bad honom (om) att sätta sig.
 we asked him about IM seat REFL
 ‘We asked him to sit down.’

Searches in a 1.2 billion word Swedish corpus yielded approximately 7 000 hits where the lemma *be* was followed by a pronoun and a bare infinitive, 2 500 hits with an infinitive marker and 120 hits with the preposition *om*.¹⁰ The main pattern in Swedish is thus the same as in Danish and Norwegian. Whether or not the infinitive marker is required, optional or impossible is an area where there is a lot of variation between the languages. Faarlund assumes that this

10. I used the search engine *Korp* <https://spraakbanken.gu.se/korp/> and search terms like the following: [lex contains “be\\.\\.vb\\.1”] [pos = “PN”]{1,1} [msd = “VB\\.INF\\.AKT”]

means that different syntactic projections are involved, but he does not really investigate whether this has any consequences.

Another example where Faarlund points out that one of the languages allows variation, and where the reader might infer that this doesn't apply to the other languages, is in the section on imperatives. Faarlund states that negation follows the verb in all the languages, but notes that in Norwegian, the negation may also precede the verb (p. 234f.).

- (25) Nb a. Gå ikke over gaten på rødt lys!
 walk not over street.DEF on red light
 'Don't cross the street on a red light!'
- b. Ikke gå over gaten!
 not walk over street.DEF
 'Don't cross the street!'

He does not mention that the order in (25b) is also found in the other Scandinavian languages, especially in child directed speech and with infinitives, dubbed prescriptive infinitives in Johannessen (2016) (see also SAG 3:595, 4:825). The form *gå* in (25) can be either imperative or infinitive.

In the section on sentence adverbials, Faarlund discusses modal particles, which is a complicated area. He categorizes the Danish particle *mon* as a question particle (p. 198), whereas GDS (2011: 1051;1161) refers to it as a 'subjective particle' which has several uses, including that of being used in questions. In the section on the future, Faarlund writes that "mainly the auxiliaries *vil* or *skal* are used as future markers" (p. 94). It would have been helpful to say explicitly here that *vill* is not used as a future marker in Swedish; it only has the meaning 'want'. Faarlund has mentioned this a few pages earlier, in the section on modal auxiliaries, (p. 90), but it could have been repeated here.¹¹

There are some minor mistakes, for example the claim on p. 254 that the relative pronouns are identical to the interrogative pronouns. Swedish *vem* 'who' is not used as a relative pronoun. Danish and Norwegian *uden/uten/utan* meaning 'without, except' corresponds to Swedish *utom*, not *utan* (p. 73), as shown in example (6). Most of these probably won't cause problems, but the

11. The temptation to interpret *vill* as a future marker also in Swedish has crept into the glossing and the translation of example (11) on p. 276. The example is taken from SAG 4: 654. The correct translation is given below.

(i) Med mindre motparten drar sig tillbaka, vill regeringen inte förhandla.
 'Unless the opposite party withdraws, the government doesn't want to negotiate.'

tree diagram illustrating the finite clause on p. 156 is confusing. In the tree, the subject *Per* originates in Spec,VP. This is unfortunate since the verb *kommer* ‘comes’ is shown to be strictly unaccusative in the section on Small clauses (5.5.). This means that *Per* should be merged as the internal argument of the verb (p. 133f.).

Given that Faarlund often presents three examples for each construction of phrase type, one from each language, the book contains a wealth of examples. Since he has compiled the examples from different sources, the lexical content of the examples may vary a lot. In most cases this is harmless, although it might increase the cognitive load for non-Scandinavian readers, but in some places it makes it harder to see what the examples are intended to show. In this respect, the data in Hulthén (1941,1944) are more helpful since they consist of an original from one of the languages together with the translations into the other two, but without English translations.

Finally I must comment on the unfortunately large number of misprints in the book – I have found more than 70. A large proportion of them are misspellings of common Swedish words which are spelled differently from Danish and Norwegian. There are many examples where the Swedish complementizer *att* is written *at*, or the verb *är* ‘is’ is written *er*; these could have been avoided. These misprints do not affect grammaticality or comprehension, but they are unfortunate, especially if this book becomes a standard reference book for Mainland Scandinavian, in which case other linguists will cite the examples.

In conclusion I would like to say that, despite my critical remarks, the publication of this book is a major achievement. It presents a lot of facts in a systematic and comprehensive, albeit sometimes idiosyncratic, fashion. As the title says, this is a book on the *syntax* of Mainland Scandinavian. It is not the right book for someone interested in inflectional morphology or dialect variation. Nor does it mention the diachronic development which may underlie the synchronic variation that is presented. It would have been nice if Faarlund had added a final chapter where he could evaluate the claim made at the outset, namely that Danish, Norwegian and Swedish “should be treated linguistically as one language” (p. 2). Given that he has shown that there is variation in practically all the syntactic domains, it would have been interesting to see what Faarlund considers to be the common core of Mainland Scandinavian syntax as well as the main differences between the languages.¹² There is, somewhat surprisingly, no attempt to compare Mainland Scandinavian syntax with Insular

12. See Holmberg & Platzack (2008) for a brief comparison.

Scandinavian (Faroese and Icelandic), although this has been a major motivating force behind a lot of the syntactic research on the Scandinavian languages, see e.g. Holmberg & Platzack (1995) and Thráinsson et al. (2017).

Not many active contemporary scholars have the grammatical knowledge, the dedication and the persistence required to write such a book. Thanks are due to Jan Terje Faarlund who took on this task and who carried it out. The last example in the book has a slight autobiographical touch.

- (26) Nn Eg tok og skreiv ei bok om skandinavisk syntaks.
 I took and wrote a book about Scandinavian syntax
 ‘I decided to write a book about Scandinavian syntax.’

This example is part of a set illustrating the use of the verb *ta* ‘take’ in so called pseudo-coordinations (p. 314f.). Faarlund comments: “The semantics of *ta* in pseudo-coordinations is hard to pin down. It may have some degree of spontaneity and unexpectedness, but may also be a consequence of a conscious decision.”

References

- Börjars, Kersti, Elisabet Engdahl & Maia Andréasson. 2003. Subject and object positions in Swedish. In Butt, Miriam & Tracy Holloway King (eds) *Proceedings of the LFG03 Conference*. Stanford: CSLI, 44–58.
- Christensen, Kirsti Koch. 1986. Norwegian *ingen*: A case of post-syntactic lexicalization. In Dahl, Östen & Anders Holmberg (eds) *Scandinavian Syntax*. Institute of Linguistics, University of Stockholm, 21–35.
- Delsing, Lars-Olof. 1993. *The Internal Structure of Noun Phrases in the Scandinavian Languages*. Lund University: Department of Scandinavian Linguistics.
- Diderichsen, Paul. 1962. *Elementær Dansk Grammatik*. København: Gyldendal.
- Engdahl, Elisabet & Filippa Lindahl. 2014. Preposed object pronouns in mainland Scandinavian. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 92, 1–32.
- Engdahl, Elisabet, Joan Maling, Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson & Annie Zaenen. 2018. Presentational sentences in Icelandic and Swedish: Roles and positions. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 101, 1–28.
- Engels, Eva. 2012. Scandinavian Negative Indefinites and Cyclic Linearization. *Syntax* 15-2, 109–141.

- Enger, Hans-Olav. 2004. Scandinavian pancake sentences as semantic agreement. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 27-1, 5–34.
- Faarlund, Jan Terje. 1977. Embedded clause reduction and Scandinavian gender agreement. *Journal of Linguistics* 13-2, 239–257.
- Faarlund, Jan Terje, Svein Lie & Kjell Ivar Vannebo. 1997. *Norsk referansegrammatikk*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- GDS = see Hansen & Heltoft.
- Hansen, Erik & Lars Heltoft. 2011. *Grammatik over det Danske Sprog*. København: Det Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab.
- Holmberg, Anders & Christer Platzack. 1995. *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holmberg, Anders & Christer Platzack. 2008. The Scandinavian Languages. In Cinque, Guglielmo and Richard S. Kayne (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 420–458.
- Hulthén, Lage. 1944. *Studier i jämförande nunordisk syntax I [Studies in comparative Nordic syntax I]*. (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift L.) Göteborg: Wettergren & Kerber.
- Hulthén, Lage. 1947. *Studier i jämförande nunordisk syntax II [Studies in comparative Nordic syntax II]*. (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift LIII.) Göteborg: Wettergren & Kerber.
- Johannessen, Janne Bondi. 2016. Prescriptive infinitives in the modern North Germanic languages: An ancient phenomenon in child-directed speech. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 39-3, 231–276.
- Josefsson, Gunlög. 2006. Peas and pancakes: On apparent disagreement and (null) light verbs in Swedish. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 32-1, 35–72.
- Julien, Marit. 2005. *Nominal Phrases from a Scandinavian Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lundquist, Björn, Ida Larsson, Maud Westendorp, Eirik Tengesdal & Anders Nøklestad. 2019. Nordic Word Order Database: Motivations, methods, material and infrastructure. *Nordic Atlas of Language Structures (NALS) Journal* 4-1, 1–33.
- NRG = see Faarlund, Lie & Vannebo.
- Nyvad, Anne Mette, Ken Ramshøj Christensen & Sten Vikner. 2017. CP-Reursion in Danish: A cP/CP Analysis. *The Linguistic Review* 34-3, 449–478.
- Platzack, Christer. 1983. Existential sentences in English, Swedish, German and Icelandic. In Karlsson, Fred (ed.) *Papers from the Seventh Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*. Helsinki, 80–100.
- SAG = see Teleman, Hellberg & Andersson.

- Teleman, Ulf, Staffan Hellberg & Erik Andersson. 1999. *Svenska Akademiens grammatik* 4 volumes. Stockholm: Norstedts. [available as searchable pdf on <https://svenska.se/grammatik/>]
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur, Caroline Heycock, Hjalmar P. Petersen & Zakaris Svabo Hansen. 2017. *Syntactic Variation in Insular Scandinavian*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vikner, Sten. 2017. CP-recursion and the derivation of verb second in Germanic main and embedded clauses. In Freitag, Constantin, Oliver Bott & Fabian Schlotterbeck (eds) *Two perspectives on V2. The invited talks of the DGfS 2016 workshop "V2 in grammar and processing: Its causes and its consequences."* Universität Konstanz, 1–26.
- Zaenen, Annie, Elisabet Engdahl & Joan Maling. 2017. Subject properties in presentational sentences in Icelandic and Swedish. In Rosén, Victoria & Koenraad De Smedt (eds) *The very model of a modern linguist*. (BeLLS 8). Bergen: University of Bergen, 260–281.

Digital resources

- Nordic Dialect Corpus (NorDiaCorp)* <http://tekstlab.uio.no/nota/scandiasyn/>
- Nordic Syntax Database* <http://tekstlab.uio.no/nota/scandiasyn/>
- Nordic Word Order Database (NWD)* <https://www.hf.uio.no/iln/om/organisasjon/tekstlab/prosjekter/nwd/index.html>

Elisabet Engdahl
Department of Swedish
University of Gothenburg
Box 200
S-405 30 Gothenburg
Sweden
elisabet.engdahl@svenska.gu.se