On the V3 particle *så* in Mainland Scandinavian, including Fenno-Swedish

Anders Holmberg (Newcastle University)

Mainland Scandinavian(MSc) features a particle *så* in the left periphery of root clauses, typically between a fronted non-argument and the fronted finite verb.

(1) Därför så kom jag för sent. [Swedish]
Therefore SÅ came I too late

It is typically optional, and the result is V3. In all varieties of MSc except Fenno-Swedish the constituent preceding cannot be a DP argument (PP arguments are marginally allowed in at least some other varieties). In all varieties, again except Fenno-Swedish, the constituent cannot be a fronted wh-phrase.

(5)a. %Till exempel reseskildringar **så** tycker jag att är väldigt intressanta. (OK in Fenno-Swedish)
for example travelogues SÅ think I that are very interesting

b. %Varför **så** kom du igen för sent? (OK in Fenno-Swedish)
Why SÅ came you again too late

Essentially two analyses have been proposed in the literature. One is that *så* is an adjunct-resumptive pronoun which satisfies the V2 condition (by hypothesis, in specFinP) when a constituent is externally merged higher in the C-domain. Hence it typically occurs with initial adjuncts or hanging topics, not with any phrase moved from IP (Holmberg 1986: 113-117). The other analysis is that *så* is a head in the C-domain (Nordström 2010, Eide 2011, Holmberg 2017). In most varieties of MSc it would be a high head, c-commanding Topic and Focus. *Så* would attracts constituents moved to or externally merged in the V2 position (again, by hypothesis specFinP; Roberts 2004, Haegeman 2012, Holmberg 2017) which are not attracted by Topic or Focus/WH. In Fenno-Swedish *så* has become (almost) a generalised C-head: it can attract a topic or a whP or almost any other constituent which is in specFinP checking V2.

Så is very commonly inserted after initial conjunctive adverbs such as *därför* 'therefore' (see (1)), *istället* 'instead', *ändå* 'still, nevertheless', etc. The generalisation, according to Holmberg (2017), is that particles which move to the C-domain from inside IP, move via specFinP, satisfying V2, and can subsequently be attracted by the higher C-head *så*. Particles which are externally merged in the C-domain don't satisfy V2 and don't occur with *så*. Examples are the conjunctive causal particle *för* 'for, because' and the high complementiser *att* introducing embedded root clauses.

(6)a. Vi kan vara ute, **för** nu regnar det inte.
we can be outside for now rains it not
'We can be outside because it isn't raining now.'

b. *Vi kan vara ute, **för** (så) regnar det inte nu.

The way to tell if an initial particle is moved is if there is a more or less synonymous counterpart with the particle still in IP.

(7)a. **Ändå** (så) vet vi ingenting./ Vi vet **ändå** ingenting.
still SÅ know we nothing/ We know still nothing

b. …**för** vi vet ingenting. / *vi vet **för** ingenting
for we know nothing

This holds true of all known varieties of MSc, including Fenno-Swedish. There are a few particles which don't conform to this pattern, though. They have a counterpart inside IP, they

can satisfy V2, but they don't combine with *så*. One is the sentential negation *inte*, another is the particle *nog*, indicating certainty on the part of the speaker. This holds true of Fenno-Swedish, too, and this is even though fronted negation or *nog* is particularly common in Fenno-Swedish.

(8)a. **Inte** (***så**) vet jag vad han vill.
Not SÅ know I what he wants
'I don't (really) know what he wants.'
b. Jag vet **inte** vad han vill.

(9)a. **Nog** (***så**) vet jag vad han vill.
NOG SÅ know I what he wants
'I know what he wants, believe me.'
b. Jag vet **nog** vad han vill.

The particle *nog* can co-occur with the negation in IP.

(10) Jag vet **nog inte** vad han vill.

Why do initial *inte* and *nog* not co-occur with *så*? The fact that they satisfy the V2 condition indicates that they are maximal categories, filling specFinP, i.e. they are not heads. But they are not attracted by *så* (under the hypothesis where *så* is a high head).

One thing that they have in common, that they don't share with most other particles, is that they are polarity items. That *inte* is a negative polarity item is hardly controversial. Initial *nog* is a positive polarity item.

(11) *Nog vet jag inte vad han vill.
NOG know I not what he wants

Comparing (10) and (11) it is fairly clear that initial *nog* is not derived by movement of IP-internal *nog* (which is not a PPI) but is externally merged. There is a corresponding semantic difference, too: (10) means roughly 'I don't actually know what he wants'. Following Holmberg (2016) I assume that finite IP is headed by a polarity feature. This feature is always merged unvalued, being assigned negative value by a negation particle or positive value by a PPI, or else gets positive value by default. The polarity feature is a property of Fin. The PPI *nog* and the NPI *inte* are merged with FinP ("in specFinP"), satisfying V2 and assigning polarity value to Pol under locality (spec-head agreement). The reason why *nog* and *inte* are not attracted by *så* can now be explained as a locality effect: They will be too distant from the polarity feature to assign a value to it.

The behaviour of these particles can thus be understood under the hypothesis that *så* is a head high in the C-domain. This does not clearly decide between the two hypotheses about the place and function of *så*, though. Under the alternative hypothesis *inte* and *nog* would have to be merged with FinP, checking V2 and thereby ruling out *så* as checker of V2 because they need to be close enough to the polarity feature.

Eide, Kristin Melum. 2011. Norwegian (non-V2) declaratives, resumptive elements, and the Wackernagel position. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 14: 179-213.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2012. *Adverbial clauses, main clause phenomena, and composition of the left periphery*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holmberg, Anders. 1986. Word order and syntactic features in the Scandinavian languages and English. PhD dissertation, Stockholm University.

Holmberg, Anders. 2016. *The syntax of yes and no*. Oxford University Press.

Holmberg, Anders. 2017. On the Bottleneck Hypothesis in Swedish. To appear in Biberauer and Wolfe (eds.) *Rethinking Verb Second*. OUP.

Nordström, Jackie. 2010. The Swedish så-construction, a new point of departure. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax 85*: 37-63.
Roberts, Ian 2004 The C-system in Brythonic Celtic languages, V2, and the EPP. In L. Rizzi (ed.) *The Cartography of syntactic structures*, volume 2. 297−327. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.