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Introduction

Different goals of variation studies

• Documentation of the (sociolinguistic) distribution of different (phonological, syntactic ...) variants within a given language
• Investigation of how innovations arise and spread (nature of change and diffusion)
• (Micro) comparison of dialects and (closely) related languages (including testing for parametric variation: which phenomena go together/exclude each other)
• Evidence for different types of individual grammars
• ...
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About IceDiaSyn and FarDiaSyn

Both studies were connected to ScanDiaSyn and NORMS

IceDiaSyn was supported by the IRF 2004-2008
FarDiaSyn was supported by the IRF 2009-2010

IceDiaSyn: a pilot study, 3 overviews (using written questionnaires), some interviews

FarDiaSyn: a pilot study, 2 overviews (using written questionnaires), more interviews
The questionnaires:

- The subjects were asked to report on their own language, i.e. what they thought they could say, and not on what they might have learned in school about good or bad language ... and they were told that the emphasis was on spoken language.

- The most common form of questions looked like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y1030</th>
<th>ja</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>nei</th>
<th>Viömeringar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Marin tímir íkki við til Havnar.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat hana vera eftir, um hon vil íkki koma við.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sára far í koncertina í kvöld.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More on IceDiaSyn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of subjects in overviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overv1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♀ 376 (48,7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♂ 396 (51,3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overv2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♀ 387 (51,3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♂ 368 (48,7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overv3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♀ 364 (51,0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♂ 349 (48,9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender distribution: green (left) = female, blue (right) = male
IceDiaSyn: Age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Overv1</th>
<th>Overv2</th>
<th>Overv3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 yrs</td>
<td>205 (26.6%)</td>
<td>197 (26.1%)</td>
<td>201 (28.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>198 (25.6%)</td>
<td>203 (26.9%)</td>
<td>179 (25.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>192 (24.9%)</td>
<td>195 (25.8%)</td>
<td>168 (23.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-70</td>
<td>177 (22.9%)</td>
<td>160 (21.2%)</td>
<td>166 (23.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>772 (100%)</td>
<td>755 (100%)</td>
<td>714 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More on IceDiaSyn ..., 3

IceDiaSyn: Distribution of places visited
(“measure points” typically about 25 for each overview)
Overview 1:

- 26 places, normally 24-32 subjects from each, except 85 from “the greater Reykjavík area”
- The country divided into 8 parts:
  Reykjavík, South-West, South, East, North-East, North-West, Western Fjords, West
More on FarDiaSyn

FarDiaSyn: a pilot study, 2 overviews, many interviews

Total number of subjects in overviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overv1</th>
<th>Overv2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♂</td>
<td>165 (49,3%)</td>
<td>160 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♀</td>
<td>170 (50,7%)</td>
<td>160 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>335</strong></td>
<td><strong>320</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender distribution: green (left) = female, blue (right) = male
More on FarDiaSyn, 2

FarDiaSyn: Age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Overv1</th>
<th>Overv2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>born 1990 and later</td>
<td>88 (26,3%)</td>
<td>106 (33,1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1989</td>
<td>75 (22,4%)</td>
<td>90 (28,1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1969</td>
<td>99 (29,6%)</td>
<td>72 (22,5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949 and earlier</td>
<td>73 (21,8%)</td>
<td>52 (16,3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>335 (100%)</td>
<td>320 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Areas visited in the Faroes

1. Streymoy (incl. Tórshavn)
2. Eysturoy
3. Norðoyggjar
4. Vágar
5. Sandoy
6. Suðuroy
More on FarDiaSyn, 4

Typically a couple of places in each area but not a fixed number of speakers in each place. More emphasis on getting a representative number of speakers from each of the 6 areas, cf. Overview 1:

- Streymoy: 73 (21.8%)
- Eysturoy: 98 (29.3%)
- Norðoyggjar: 77 (23.0%)
- Vágar: 41 (12.2%)
- Sandoy: 19 (5.7%)
- Suðuroy: 27 (8.1%)
Why did we do it like this?

A question:
• Why (on earth) this large number of speakers in IceDiaSyn and FarDiaSyn? In syntactic variation studies it is common to have just 2 or 4 subjects for each “measure point” (cf. the SAND project and most of ScanDiaSyn (though not in the data collection in the Faroes 2008)).

Main reason:
The kind of variation expected in Icelandic and Faroese syntax (and confirmed e.g. by the pilot studies), namely:
• no obvious or clear-cut regional variation
• considerable difference between generations
• extensive intra-speaker variation (cf. also Jóhannes Gísli Jónsson and Thórhallur Eythórsson 2005)
“no obvious clear-cut regional variation”:

• Consequence: If you randomly pick just 2 or 4 subjects per “measuring point”, you get the Forrest Gump effect: It’s “a box of chocolates. You never know what you’re gonna get”.
**IceDiaSyn: Dative Substitution (DS)**

**Subject case:** Typical **Dative Substitution** (“sickness”):

(1) a T2005  Okkur **Þorvaldi** langar að fara á þorrablót.
us Thorvald(D) wants to go to winter-party
‘Me and Thorvaldur want to go to winter-party.’

b T2041  **Strákunum** langar til að fara með honum.
the-boys(D) want for to go with him
‘The boys want to go with him.’

c T2091  Hann spurði hvort mér vantaði ekki lán.
he asked whether me (D) needed not loan
’He asked whether I didn’t need a loan.’

d T2111  Hún heldur að **honum** vanti annan síma.
she thinks that him(D) needs another phone
‘She thinks that he needs another phone.’
Picking chocolates for DS

YM = Younger male,  YF = Younger female (20-25)
OM = Older male,  OF = Older female (65-70)

Chocolates A in Reykjavík:
YM-RA51  rejects all these DS-examples (1a-d)
YF-RB59  rejects all these DS-examples
OM-RA210  rejects all these DS-examples
OF-RA207  rejects all these DS-examples

So what should we conclude about DS in Reykjavík?
Picking chocolates for DS, 2

What if we had picked a different set of 4 speakers in Reykjavík?

**Chocolates B in Reykjavík:**
YM-RB51 accepts all the DS-examples above
YF-RB55 accepts all the DS-examples above

OM-RA218 finds a = questionable  b = OK
c = bad   d = OK

OF-RA208 finds a = bad  b = OK
c = questionable  d = OK

So what should we conclude about DS in Reykjavík?
IceDiaSyn: The New Passive (NewP)

Typical **New Passive** examples:

(2)a T1005 það var rekið manninn út af staðnum.
there was driven(n.) the-man(Am.) out of the place
’The man was thrown out.’

b T1006 það var strax dæmt vítaspyrnu.
there was immediately judged(n.) penalty-kick(Af.)
’Penalty was immediately given.’

c T1019 það var borðað svo margar kjötbollur.
there was eaten(n.) so many meatballs(Apl.f.)
’So many meatballs were eaten.’

d T1043 það var beðið mig að vaska upp.
there was asked me(A) to wash up
’I was asked to do the dishes (wash up).’
Picking chocolates for NewP

Chocolates A in Keflavík:

YM-977 rejects all the NewP examples above (2a-d)
YF-976 finds (2a) questionable, rejects the others.

OM-948 rejects all the NewP examples above
OF-955 rejects all the NewP examples above

What should we conclude about NewP in Keflavík?
Picking chocolates for NewP, 2

What if we had picked a different set of 4 speakers in Keflavík?

Chocolates B in Keflavík:

YM-971 accepts all the NewP examples above
YF-952 finds (2c) questionable but accepts the others

OM-970 finds (2b) OK but rejects the others
OF-973 finds (2b) OK but rejects the others

What should we conclude about NewP in Keflavík?
FarDiaSyn: EV2 in non-bridge contexts

Typical EV2 (= ‘embedded V2’ (i.e. Vfin-Adv) examples:

(3)a Y1003 Hann er keddur av, at Jógván hefur ongantíð lisið hana.
he is sorry about that Jogvan has never read her
‘He is sorry that Jogvan has never read it.’

b Y1030 Lat hana vera eftir, um hon vil ikki koma við.
let her be after if she wants not come with
‘Leave her alone if she doesn’t want to come with us.’

c Y1053 Hann spurdi, hví Pætur hevði ikki lisið bókina.
he asked why Peter had not read the-book

d Y1078 Har var nógvur matur, sum hon hevði ongantíð smakkað.
there was much food that she had never tasted
‘There they had a lot of food that she had never tasted.’
Picking chocolates for Far. EV2

Chocolates A in Tórshavn:

YM-T25: Rejects all the EV2 examples above (3a-d)
YF-N6: Rejects all the EV2 examples above
OM-N24: Rejects all the EV2 examples above
OF-T24: Rejects all the EV2 examples above

What should we conclude about EV2 in Tórshavn?
Picking chocolates for Far. EV2, 2

Chocolates B in Tórshavn:

YM-N5: Finds (3b,c) fine and (3a,d) questionable.

YF-N9: Finds (3b,c) fine and (3a,d) bad.

OM-T19: Finds (3a,b) fine and (3c,d) questionable.

OF-N21: Finds (3b,c,d) fine and (3a) bad.

What should we conclude about EV2 in Tórshavn?
The upshot of this

• Because of the kind of variability found in Icelandic and Faroese we would run the risk of getting misleading results in IceDiaSyn and FarDiaSyn about syntactic variation in Icelandic and Faroese if we just had 2-4 informants in each place (“measure point”).

• Hence we decided to test many more informants in IceDiaSyn and FarDiaSyn.

Question:
• What kind of interesting results can such a (quantitative) study yield?
More about “what” and “why”

“considerable difference between generations”

Why would it be interesting to study such differences?
• For sociolinguists it is obviously interesting: Linguistic difference between any definable groups of speakers is interesting.
• For (at least some) historical linguists and generativists (e.g. Lightfoot 1999, 2006; Kroch 2001; Hale 2007 ...) it is interesting since it can tell you something about the nature and types of linguistic change (cf. slide 3 above)
• Like most interesting research topics, this one is bound to raise new questions.
Dative Substitution: All informants (cf. the expls. in (1)):

Table 1: Judgments of selected DS examples in IceDiaSyn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Dative subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. T2005</td>
<td><strong>Okkur þorvaldi langar að fara á þorraðlót.</strong></td>
<td>68,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. T2041</td>
<td><strong>Strákunum langar til að fara með honum.</strong></td>
<td>68,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. T2091</td>
<td>Hann spurði hvort <strong>mér</strong> vantaði ekki lán.</td>
<td>27,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. T2111</td>
<td>Hún heldur að <strong>honum</strong> vanti annan síma.</td>
<td>55,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the relatively low acceptance of the 1st person subj. in c, typical for DS (cf. Ásta Svavarsdóttir 2012 and refs. cited there).
IceDiaSyn: Some results, 2

**Question:** Is this a “stable” situation or changing (cf. e.g. Finnur Friðriksson 2004, 2005, 2009)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20–25</th>
<th>40–45</th>
<th>65–70</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. T2005</td>
<td>Ökkur þorvaldi langar að fara á þorraðlótt.</td>
<td>74,5%</td>
<td>75,7%</td>
<td>69,6%</td>
<td>50,6%</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. T2041</td>
<td>Strákunum langar til að fara með honum.</td>
<td>79,6%</td>
<td>78,0%</td>
<td>66,7%</td>
<td>43,8%</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. T2091</td>
<td>Hann spurði hvort mér vantaði ekki lán.</td>
<td>46,9%</td>
<td>35,1%</td>
<td>15,4%</td>
<td>7,5%</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. T2111</td>
<td>Hún heldur að honum vanti annan síma.</td>
<td>79,9%</td>
<td>71,4%</td>
<td>43,6%</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: (Positive) judgments of DS by different age groups in IceDiaSyn*

**Quite clear and statistically significant differences.**

(p < 0,01 is fine; p < 0,05 is not so fine her since the sample is so big. Correlation (r): 0,1 = small effect; 0,3 = medium effect; 0,5 = large effect (cf. Field 2005:32))
IceDiaSyn: Some results, 3

A bar chart representing the DS-results

Figure 1: “Mean grade” (rejections) for the DS-examples in (1) (where 1 = accepts all examples, 3 = rejects all examples)
IceDiaSyn: Some results, 4

**Question** (or an intermezzo):
• Do figures like *fig. 1* necessarily represent “a change in progress”?

Possible interpretations of bar charts *fig. 1* (cf. e.g. Labov 2001:83; Sankoff and Blondeau 2007:562–563):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bars</th>
<th>poss. interpr.</th>
<th>indiv. spks</th>
<th>ling. comm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. even</td>
<td>stability</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. even</td>
<td>cont. change</td>
<td>change</td>
<td>changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. uneven (cf. <em>fig. 1</em>)</td>
<td>age grading</td>
<td>change</td>
<td>stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. uneven (cf. <em>fig. 1</em>)</td>
<td>lifetime change</td>
<td>change</td>
<td>changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. uneven (cf. <em>fig. 1</em>)</td>
<td>apparent-time</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age grading**: When a particular linguistic trait decreases or increases with age and this development repeats itself with new generations.

**Lifetime change**: When individuals change their language as they grow older (and this typically continues in the same direction with a new generation).

**An important question**: To what extent is “lifetime change” possible?
IceDiaSyn: Some results, 5

New Passive: All informants (cf. the expls. in (2)):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a T1005</td>
<td>það var rekðið manninn út af staðnum.</td>
<td>18,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>72,0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b T1006</td>
<td>það var strax dáæt vítaspyrnu.</td>
<td>33,8</td>
<td>12,2</td>
<td>54,0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c T1019</td>
<td>það var borgað svo margar kjötballur.</td>
<td>15,2</td>
<td>11,6</td>
<td>73,2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d T1043</td>
<td>það var bæðið mig að vaska upp.</td>
<td>18,1</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>70,9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Table 3: Judgments of selected NewP examples_

Note: Much less “popular” then the DS-examples.
**IceDiaSyn: Some results, 6**

Evaluation of the NewP examples by different age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20–25</th>
<th>40–45</th>
<th>65–70</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a T1005</td>
<td>bað var rekio manninn út af staðnum.</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b T1006</td>
<td>bað var strax dæmt vítaspyrnu.</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c T1019</td>
<td>bað var borðað svo margar kjötbollur.</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d T1043</td>
<td>bað var beðið mig að vaska upp.</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: (Positive) judgments of NewP by different age groups*

Very clear and strong correlation with age. Note the relatively high acceptance of the b-example, also by the older generations.
Figure 2: “Mean grade” (rejections) for the NewP examples in (2) (where 1 = accepts all examples, 3 = rejects all examples)

The oldest groups reject virtually everything (except for b).
So what is the interest of data of this sort?

- Shows the (relatively slow) **diffusion** of a linguistic change (Dative Substitution — unclear origin)
- Shows the origin of a “**new**” change that does not seem to spread across generations but “grow” fast nevertheless (New Passive)
- The two **changes are of different types**: DS is “lexically conditioned”, i.e. spreads to semantically related verbs but to different degrees (experiencer-type verbs like ‘want’, ‘need’, ‘look forward to’, ‘be apprehensive about’ ..., cf. Jóhannes and Thórhallur 2004, 2005; Ásta Svavarsdóttir 2012 and refs. cited there), whereas NewP is purely structural ...
IceDiaSyn: Some results, 9

Additional questions related to this:

- Is any **age-grading** or **lifetime change** involved here? Can/do speakers’ grammars change w.r.t. these phenomena?

- How has the school system tried to “deal” with this? Has that made any difference — or what kind?

The first question is being studied in a new project on “linguistic change in real time” (IRF 2010-2012), the second will probably come up in Hanna Óladóttir’s talk at this conference (Wednesday)
FarDiaSyn: Some results

The EV2 examples: All informants (cf. the expls. in (3)):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Y1003</td>
<td>Hann er keddur av, at Jógvan hevur ongantið lisið hana.</td>
<td>25,8</td>
<td>22,8</td>
<td>51,4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Y1030</td>
<td>Lat hana vera eftir, um hon vil ikki koma við.</td>
<td>52,4</td>
<td>12,7</td>
<td>34,8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Y1053</td>
<td>Hann spurdi, hví Pætur hevði ikki lisið bókina.</td>
<td>27,4</td>
<td>18,3</td>
<td>54,3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Y1078</td>
<td>Har var nógur matur, sum hon hevði ongantið smakkað.</td>
<td>29,1</td>
<td>18,3</td>
<td>52,6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Judgments of EV2 examples in FarDiaSyn

More generally accepted than usually assumed (see also Ásgrímur Angantýsson 2011 and refs. cited there).
FarDiaSyn: Some results, 2

Evaluation of the EV2 examples by different age groups

Table 6: (Positive) judgments of NewP by different age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20–25</th>
<th>40–45</th>
<th>65–70</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Y1003</td>
<td>Hann er keddur av, at Jógvan hevur ongantið lísið hana.</td>
<td>34,1%</td>
<td>24,3%</td>
<td>18,2%</td>
<td>28,4%</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Y1030</td>
<td>Lat hana vera eftir, um hon vil íkki koma við.</td>
<td>57,0%</td>
<td>46,7%</td>
<td>52,0%</td>
<td>53,5%</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Y1053</td>
<td>Hann spurdí, hví Þætur hevði íkki lísið bókina.</td>
<td>40,2%</td>
<td>27,0%</td>
<td>18,6%</td>
<td>24,3%</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Y1078</td>
<td>Har var nógvur matur, sum hon hevði ongantið smakkað.</td>
<td>36,8%</td>
<td>28,0%</td>
<td>24,7%</td>
<td>26,5%</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No correlation with age — the youngest group more positive than the others if anything.
Table 7: (Positive) judgments of EV2 examples in different areas

No consistent differences between areas – and typically not statistically significant (an exception (sort of): $p = 0.038$ for the a-example in a chi-square test).
FarDiaSyn: Some results, 4

... or visualized on a bar chart:

Figure 3: Mean “grade” (rejections) for selected EV2 examples, in the different areas (where 1 = accepts everything, 3 = rejects everything)
FarDiaSyn vs. IceDiaSyn

Some Icelandic EV2 examples for comparison:

(4) a T2007 Honum sárnaði að Kastljósið fjallaði aldrei um þær.
   him (D) hurt that the Spotlight discussed never about them
   ‘He was upset that the Spotlight never discussed them.’

b T2110 Hún spurði hvort þeir hefðu allttaf verið flughræddir.
   she asked whether they had always been afraid-of-flying
   ‘She asked whether they had always been afraid of flying.’

c T2027 Þar var alls konar matur sem henni líkaði ekki.
   there was all sorts of food that her (D) liked not
   ‘There they had a lot of food that she did not like.’
FarDiaSyn vs. IceDiaSyn

Evaluation of the Icelandic EV2 examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a T2007</td>
<td>Honum sárnaðí að Kastljósið fjallaðí alreið um þær.</td>
<td>73,9</td>
<td>12,3</td>
<td>13,8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b T2110</td>
<td>Hún spurði hvort þeir hefðu alltaf verið flughræddir.</td>
<td>88,8</td>
<td>7,2</td>
<td>4,0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c T2027</td>
<td>þar var alls konar matur sem henni líkaði ekki.</td>
<td>87,5</td>
<td>7,5</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 8: Judgments of EV2 examples in IceDiaSyn*

Not surprisingly, more generally accepted than in Faroese.
FarDiaSyn vs. IceDiaSyn

EV2: Further comparison between Faroese and Icelandic

Figure 4: FarDiaSyn

Figure 5: IceDiaSyn

“Mean grade” (rejections) for the EV2 examples in (3) FarDiaSyn and (4) IceDiaSyn (where 1 = accepts everything and 3 = rejects everything)
The upshot of this

What is the usefulness of this kind of data? They can at least be used to **dispel some myths** about Faroese syntax (resulting from the Forrest Gump effect), such as the following (see also the discussion in Bentzen et al. 2009 and Heycock et al. 2010):

- there is (virtually) no EV2 in embedded clauses in Faroese
- Faroese is just like Icelandic w.r.t. EV2
- younger speakers of Faroese are the least likely to accept EV2 in embedded clauses, because EV2 is on the way out
- EV2 is most common in Sandoy (cf. Heðin Brú) and least common in Vágar (cf. Hjalmar Petersen)
- Faroese can be neatly split into Faroese 1 and Faroese 2 (North/South?), one more MSc-like than the other
FarDiaSyn, Bentzen et al., Heycock et al.

Considerable agreement

• no clear regional differences (despite somewhat different methods (FarDiaSyn: three point scale; Bentzen et al. 2009: five point scale (actually converted to three points: 1+2 = rejected, 3 = marginal, 4+5 = accepted); Heycock et al. 2010: magnitude estimation):

• no obvious differences between age groups

Some differences:

• Bentzen et al. and Heycock et al. found that the order V-Neg was more likely to be rejected than V-Adv (other than Neg). We did not.

• Bentzen et al. found that the order MainV_{fin}-Adv was more likely to be rejected than Aux_{fin}-Adv We did not.
Neg vs. (other) Advs, Aux vs. MV

Example pairs to compare:

(5) a Y1003 Hann er keddur av, at Jógván hevur ongantíð lisið hana.
   he is sad that Jogvan has never read it (Aux-Adv)

   b Y1019 Tað er spell, at bókin kemur ikki út til jóla.
   it is too-bad that the-book comes not out for Xmas (MV-Neg)

   c Y1099 Hon dugir íslendskt, hóast hon hevur ongantíð verið í Íslandi.
   she knows Icelandic although she has never been in Iceland (Aux-Adv)

   d Y1030 Lat hana vera eftir, um hon vil ikki koma við.
   leave her behind if she wants not come with (us) (MV-Neg)

   e Y1053 Hann spurdi, hví Pætur hevði ikki lisið bókina.
   he asked why Peter had not read the-book (Aux-Neg)

   f Y1070 Abbin spyr, hví hon drekkur ongantíð kaffi.
   Grandpa asks why she drinks never coffee (MV-Adv)

   g Y1078 Har var nógvur matur, sum hon hevði ongantíð smakkað.
   there was much food that she had never tasted (Aux-Adv)

   h Y1094 Har hitti hann vinmenn, sum hann hevði ikki sæð í nógv ár.
   there met he friends that he had not seen in many years (Aux-Neg)
Neg vs. (other) Adv, Aux vs. MV

Comparing pairs of examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Y1003</td>
<td>Hann er keddur av, at Jógvan hevur ongantið lisía hana.</td>
<td>25,8</td>
<td>22,8</td>
<td>51,4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Y1019</td>
<td>Tað er spell, at bókin kemur íkkú út til jóla.</td>
<td>24,6</td>
<td>21,0</td>
<td>54,4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Y1099</td>
<td>Hon dugir íslenskt, höast hon hevur ongantið verið í Íslandi.</td>
<td>36,9</td>
<td>18,8</td>
<td>44,3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Y1030</td>
<td>Lat hana vera aftir, um hon vil íkkú koma við.</td>
<td>52,4</td>
<td>12,7</td>
<td>34,8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Y1053</td>
<td>Hann spurdi, hvi Pétur hevði íkkú lisía bókina.</td>
<td>27,4</td>
<td>18,3</td>
<td>54,3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Y1070</td>
<td>Abbin spyr, hvi hon drekkur ongantið kaffi.</td>
<td>17,7</td>
<td>20,7</td>
<td>61,6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Y1078</td>
<td>Har var nógvur matur, sum hon hevði ongantið smakkað.</td>
<td>29,1</td>
<td>18,3</td>
<td>52,6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h Y1094</td>
<td>Har hitti hann vinmenn, sum hann hevði íkkú sæð í nógv ár.</td>
<td>37,6</td>
<td>14,7</td>
<td>47,7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 9*: Comparison of EV2 examples with negation, (other) adverbs, finite auxiliaries and finite main verbs.
Types of Icelandic and Faroese grammars

Are there only two grammars, e.g. Far1 and Far2?

Figure 6: Mean “grades” for the EV2 examples (where 1 = accepts everything, 3 = rejects everything; so there are 32 speakers who have “a pure MSc-like grammar”)
Types of grammars, 2

Another example of intra-speaker variation: DS in IceDiaSyn

**Figure 7**: Mean “grades” for the DS examples in (1) (see Höskuldur Thráinsson 2012 and refs. cited there)
Concluding remarks

By designing IceDiaSyn and FarDiaSyn as large-scale quantitative studies we have:

- made new discoveries about the extent of syntactic variation in Icelandic and Faroese
- learned which variants are on their way out and which ones appear to be stable or gaining ground
- seen that different variants may spread (diffuse) in different ways
- learned more about possible grammars

... but a number of new questions have also arisen, e.g.:

- how/to what extent do speakers’ grammars change?
- how consistent are speakers in their judgments?
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