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Abstract
A characteristic feature of the left periphery in Mainland Scandinavian is the particle så occurring optionally between certain fronted constituents and the finite verb in root clauses. Following Eide (2011) the particle will be analysed as a head high in the C-domain, a variety of declarative Force with the features [D-Force, −Top, −Foc]. It will attract mainly adjuncts, except wh-adjuncts. The corresponding particle in Fenno-Swedish has a freer distribution, having the features [D-Force, −Operator], meaning that it accepts as specifier any fronted phrase except pure operators. Så also occurs, in a different construction, checking the EPP of Fin in clausal complements of the conjunctions eller ‘or’ and och ‘and’ in Swedish.

1. Introduction
A characteristic feature of the left periphery in Mainland Scandinavian is the particle så occurring optionally between certain fronted constituents and the finite verb in root clauses (all examples are Swedish, except where indicated otherwise).
(1) Egentligen (så) vill jag helst bli hemma.
   actually SÅ would I rather stay home
   ‘I would actually rather stay home.’

The form så has a variety of meanings and functions, including that of a consecutive conjunction, as in (2a), or VP-proform, as in (2b), or AP-intensifier, as in (2c).

(2)  a. Jag är trött, så jag blir hemma.
      ‘I’m tired, so I’ll stay home.’
   b. Gör så!
      ‘Do so!’
   c. Du är så vacker.
      ’You are so beautiful.’

In all these cases its use parallels that of its English cognate so. The particle så which is discussed in this paper, on the other hand, is an uninterpretable, expletive element which has no translation into English, and will be glossed as SÅ. In most varieties of Mainland Scandinavian the broad generalisation is that this particle occurs between an adjunct and the finite verb in the left periphery (Holmberg 1986: 109-118, Nordström 2010, Eide 2011). It is typically optional. See Salvesen (to appear) on the history of this particle.

(3)a. I morgon (så) har vi öppet som vanligt.
      tomorrow SÅ have we open as usual
      ‘Tomorrow we are open as usual.’
b. Troligtvis (så) är det ingenting.
   probably SÅ is it nothing
   ‘It’s probably nothing.’

c. När jag vaknade (så) lyste solen på mig.
   when I woke up SÅ shone the sun on me
   ‘When I woke up the sun was shining on me.’

d. Den här skjortan (*så) älskar jag.
   this here shirt SÅ love I
   ‘I love this shirt.’

(3d) exemplifies the fact that a fronted argument cannot co-occur with så, except in one dialect or family of dialects, namely Fenno-Swedish, a fact which will be discussed in section 6.

Eide (2011) and Nordström (2010) have argued that the Mainland Scandinavian left-periphery particle så is a head in the C-domain attracting mainly adjuncts to move to its specifier position. I will review and provide more arguments supporting this analysis, embedding it in a formal description of the ‘fine structure of the left periphery’ (cf. Rizzi 1997) in Swedish. I will discuss some cases where Swedish så has a different role, though. One is when så functions as a default ‘checker of V2’ in certain conjoined clauses. Another is characteristic of Fenno-Swedish, where så functions as an ‘anti-operator’ particle, as I will argue, allowing anything in its specifier position as long as it is not a pure operator. Yet another case, also characteristic of Fenno-Swedish, is when så functions as a link between a hanging topic and ForceP.²
2. The derivation of V3 with så

2.1 Så as checker of V2 in construction with externally merged adjuncts

An initially attractive idea is that så functions as a default satisfier of V2, employed whenever a constituent is externally merged in the C-domain, rather than being moved/internally merged there. This idea has been rejected by Nordström (2010) as well as Eide (2011). I will reject it as well for the cases of V3 så that they discuss, although, as I will show, this does not account for all occurrences of this particle. The following are some theoretical preliminaries.

I will adopt, in essence, the theory of V2 as found in Germanic languages but also in some Romance languages which is articulated in works such as Haegeman (1996), Roberts (2004), Beninca and Poletto (2004), Holmberg (2015, to appear). According to this theory, Fin in main clauses, the lowest head in the C-domain, has a V-feature attracting a verb and an EPP-feature attracting a maximal category to ‘its spec’, i.e. to merge with FinP. This yields V2 order. The maximal category checking the EPP of Fin (‘checking V2’) is typically moved from inside IP, but, as discussed in Holmberg (to appear), may in some cases be externally merged with FinP. Whether the constituent in spec of Fin, checking V2, is internally or externally merged there, it will prevent movement of any other constituent from IP. This is the so called bottleneck effect: spec of Fin is a bottleneck through which movement to the C-domain has to go, and only one constituent can do that.

There is little reason to think that så is moved from inside IP (see Nordström 2010), so if it is responsible for checking the EPP of Fin, it would be externally merged with FinP. The structure of (1) with så would be (4), where the adverb as well as så would be externally merged in the C-domain, and så would check the EPP-feature of Fin.
The structure of (1) without så, would have the structure (5), with the adverb moving from inside IP (hence the copy in IP), internally merging with FinP, checking the EPP of Fin.

This is, you could say, what is proposed in Holmberg (1986), translated into modern terms.

This presupposes that adverbs, although they can be externally merged in IP and moved to the C-domain, can alternatively be externally merged in the C-domain. In the former case the verb would immediately follow the adverb or other adjunct; in the latter case there would be så merging with FinP, checking the EPP of Fin, followed by external merge of the adjunct in the C-domain. The prediction is that så would only occur with constituents that can be externally merged in the C-domain, hence not with arguments, as in (2d). If wh-questions, including adjunct wh-questions, are always derived by movement, it would follow that så does not occur in wh-questions, including adjunct questions, which is correct.
There are good reasons to reject this analysis, though. As pointed out by Eide (2011), we never find expletive (uninterpretable) så in initial position, as we might do if så were a default checker of the EPP of Fin. (6a) is an impersonal sentence where så could conceivably serve to check the EPP of Fin, as the expletive pronoun does in (6b), but this does not happen.

(6)  

a. *Så finns fästingar i Skottland.  
   SÅ are ticks in Scotland  

b. Det finns fästingar i Skottland.  
   EXPL are ticks in Scotland  

   ‘There are ticks in Scotland.’

As an argument against the hypothesis that så only occurs with constituents that are externally merged in the C-domain, Nordström (2010) points out that PP arguments can, at least marginally, co-occur with så. Being arguments they must have moved from IP.

(7)a. Där så har jag aldrig bott  
   there SÅ have I never lived  

   ‘There, I’ve never lived.’

b. I det här fönstret så skulle man kunna ställa pelargonian.  
   in this here window SÅ would one could put the geranium  

   ‘In this window you could put the geranium.’

Consider also (8).
Scandinavian has a reflexive possessive which has to be bound in the local binding domain. The non-reflexive possessive pronoun, on the other hand, must be free in the local binding domain (Hellan 1988). The initial adjunct in (8b) therefore must be reconstructed for binding. By that criterion it must have moved. Yet it can occur with så. This is incompatible with the analysis of så as a default checker of the EPP of Fin occurring specifically with constituents externally merged in the C-domain.

Finally, there is a construction where så is indeed used as a default checker of V2, but it looks different from the standard cases of så in (1) and (2), and will be discussed below in section 4.

2.2 så as copy-left-dislocation

An alternative idea is that the så-construction is a form of copy left-dislocation. A version of this analysis is articulated by Nordström (2010), another version by Eide (2011), also assumed and further articulated by Holmberg (to appear). Copy left-dislocation is the construction in (9).³
(9) a. Sockorna dom har jag tvättat.
    the.socks them have I washed
    ‘I have washed the socks.’

b. Sportig det är han inte.
    sporty that is he not
    ‘Sporty he isn’t.’

c. I morgon då öppnar vi tidigt.
    tomorrow then open we early
    ’Tomorrow we open early.’

An initial argument, predicate, or circumstantial adverbial is followed by a coreferent proform, followed by the finite verb and the rest of the clause. When the initial constituent is an argument or predicate, there is a corresponding gap in the IP. The discourse function of the initial constituent is topic (see Eide 2011). The traditional analysis is that the initial constituent is externally merged outside the core sentence, as a ‘satellite’, while the proform has moved from inside IP, satisfying V2 (Koster 1978, Holmberg 1986: 113-114). However, Eide (2011), Nordström (2010) and Holmberg (to appear) argue for an alternative analysis (see also Grohmann 2000, Grewendorff 2002 on German): The proform is a Topic head, projecting a Topic phrase (TopP), attracting a phrasal constituent which functions as aboutness topic. In accordance with the bottleneck hypothesis, the fronted constituent would first be attracted by Fin, merging with FinP, checking the EPP-feature of Fin, and would then move on and merge with TopP (Holmberg, to appear), attracted by an EPP-feature of Top. The relation between the fronted constituent and the ‘proform’ would be agreement: The Top head agrees with the fronted topic phrase, and is spelled out accordingly. The fronted object in, for example, (9a) is
[3PL] with Accusative case assigned to it in the VP. These feature values are copied by the Top head, which gets spelled out as dom (in most varieties of colloquial Swedish).

If this analysis of copy-left-dislocation is accepted, then it is but a short step to assume that så is also a head in the C-domain, higher than Fin, which attracts not an argument or predicate, but an adjunct which has moved from IP, merging with FinP where it checks the EPP of Fin, and then moves on, triggered by an EPP-feature of så.

Holmberg (to appear), following Eide (2011), identifies the copy-left-dislocation head as Force-Top, heading Force-TopP. It combines the properties of Force (in Haegeman’s 2004, 2010, 2012 sense) with the properties of a Topic head. The force that is encoded by Force-Top is declarative, call it D-Force, distinct from Q-Force, which heads direct questions (see Holmberg 2016: 17-22). In parallel fashion, the head så would be another exponent of D-Force.

I will now make this theory more explicit, as follows:

D-Force has three exponents:

(11) a. [D-Force] (spelled out as null)  
    b. [D-Force, +Top, uϕ, EPP] (spell-out determined by agreement)  
    c. [D-Force, -Top, -Foc, EPP] (spelled out så)

D-Force merges with FocP or, in the absence of FocP, with FinP. (11b) is the head of the copy-left-dislocation construction, (11c) is the head of the så-construction. (11a) is the null exponent, by hypothesis present whenever (11b,c) are not. The effect of the feature +Top in (11b) is that
the $\psi$-probe can only probe, and the EPP-feature can only attract, constituents with a topic feature. The effect of the features [-Top, -Foc] in (11c) is that the EPP feature can only attract constituents that have neither topic nor focus-features. This will be elaborated in section 3.

ForceP is the highest head in the CP-phase, the maximal range of movement from IP. ForceP can merge with other constituents including hanging topics and various speech-act-modifying items. I will lump those together as constituents of the ‘Frame-field’ (Beninca and Poletto 2004, Eide 2011, Holmberg, to appear).^4

The structure of the left periphery of a root clause would be (12), where Force, if it is declarative Force, may have a [+Top] feature or a [-Top, -Foc] feature paired with an EPP-feature.

\[(\text{Frame}) [\text{ForceP} \text{ Force} [\text{FocP} \text{ Focus} [\text{FinP} \text{ Fin IP}]]]\]

As discussed, root clause Fin has a V-feature attracting the highest verb and an EPP-feature attracting a constituent usually by movement/internal merge, but in some cases by external merge. If the constituent merged with FinP has a focus feature, it will be attracted by Focus to merge again with FocP. If Force is declarative and has features matching the constituent merged with FinP, that constituent will be attracted to merge with ForceP.

3. **Categories that can and cannot occur with så**

The following categories cannot occur with så (I return to the case of Fenno-Swedish in section 6): fronted arguments (DPs, CPs, PPs), fronted predicates (VPs, APs, predicative NPs) and wh-phrases.
(12) Fronted arguments:

a. Den här skjortan (*så) älskar jag. (DP-fronting)
   this here shirt SÅ love I
   ‘I love this shirt.’

b. Att du kan sjunga (*så) vet jag. (CP-fronting)
   that you can sing SÅ know I
   ‘I know that you can sing.’

c. Till Oslo (*så) vill hon inte flytta. (Argument PP-fronting)
   to Oslo SÅ wants she not move
   ‘She doesn’t want to move to Oslo.’

(13) Fronted predicates

a. Spela piano (*så) kan han. (VP-fronting)
   play piano SÅ can he
   ‘Play the piano he can.’

b. Sportig (*så) är han inte. (Predicative AP-fronting)
   sporty SÅ is he not
   ‘He is not sporty.’

c. Ordförande (*så) vill jag inte bli. (Predicative NP-fronting)
   chairperson SÅ want I not become
   ‘I don’t want to become chairperson.’
As mentioned (see (7a,b)), argument PPs are sometimes at least marginally acceptable with så.

Fronted arguments and predicates can all be copy-left-dislocated, i.e. can occur with an overt agreeing topic-marker. In the case of fronted CPs or predicates, the marker will be *det* ‘it’, the default topic-marker. This is exemplified in (15); compare (15a) with (12b) and (15b) with (13a).

The generalisation is that så and the agreeing topic marker have complementary distribution, as codified in (11). With wh-questions neither is possible. Wh-phrases move only as far as FocP, and are not attracted by any variety of Force (but see section 6 on Fenno-Swedish). In
direct questions (root clause questions) Force is question-Force (Q-Force; see Holmberg 2016: 17-22).

Another generalization is that categories in the left periphery which do not interact with V2, do not occur with så. This includes hanging topics and various speech-act-related particles, all constituents in the Frame-field. Compare (16a,b,c). In (16a) the initial PP is fronted, checking V2, and it can therefore occur with så (having moved a second time, internally merging with ForceP). In (16b) the initial PP is a hanging topic, as shown (or induced) by the particle ja, a hanging-topic-marking device (see Eide 2011, Holmberg, to appear). The hanging topic does not itself check V2, which is why the adverb då ‘then’, by hypothesis moved from within IP, checking V2 on the way, is required. (16c) shows that the hanging topic does not co-occur with så.6

(16) a. I lördags (så) hade dom stängt hela dagen.
   on Saturday SÅ had they closed all day
   ‘On Saturday they were closed all day.’

   b. I lördags ja, *(då) hade dom stängt hela dagen.
      on Saturday PRT then had they closed all day
      ‘On Saturday, that day they were closed all day.’

   c. *I lördags ja, (så) hade dom stängt hela dagen.

(17) shows that the particle hördu, roughly ‘well’ or ‘you know’, does not check V2, and also does not occur with så.7
(17) a. Hördu det var ingen hemma.
   PRT there was nobody home
   ’Well, there was nobody home.’
   b. *Hördu var det ingen hemma.
      well was there nobody home
   c. *Hördu så var det ingen hemma.
      well SÅ was there nobody home

According to Holmberg (2013, 2016) the answer particles ja ’yes’ and nej ’no’ are in Focus position in the C-domain, often with the entire FinP deleted, leaving just the focused particle spelled out. As shown in (18a,b), they do not check V2 and they do not co-occur with så.

(18) Question: Kommer du?
   ’Are you coming?’
   a. Ja (jag kommer).
      yes I come
   b. *Ja (så) kommer jag.

(16, 17, 18) also all serve to corroborate that så itself does not check V2, as was also argued in section 2.1.

As for categories that can occur with så, with one exceptions to be discussed below, the generalisation is that any kind of adjunct that can be fronted at all, can occur with så, in Swedish. This includes circumstantial adverbials (CPs and PPs mostly), most kinds of sentence
adverbs, and conjunctive adverbs and particles (that is words and phrases meaning ‘yet’, ‘however’, ‘on the contrary’, etc.).

(19) a. Om han kommer, (så) går jag. (Conditional clause)
    if he comes SÅ go I
    ‘If he comes, I will leave.’

b. Som jag nyss sa, (så) tar vi paus nu. (Speech act-modifying clause)
    as I just said SÅ take we break now
    ‘As I just said, we’re taking a break now.’

c. I morgon (så) har vi öppet som vanligt. (Time adverbial PP)
    tomorrow SÅ have we open as usual
    ‘Tomorrow we’re open as usual.’

d. Med vänstra ögat (så) ser jag nästan ingenting. (Instrumental adverbial PP)
    with left eye SÅ see I almost nothing
    ‘With my left eye, I can’t see almost anything.’

e. Tydligen (så) var dom inte nöjda. (Epistemic adverb)
    apparently SÅ were they not satisfied
    ‘Apparently they were not satisfied.’

f. Ärligt talat (så) har jag fått nog. (Speech act adverb)
    honestly speaking SÅ have I had enough
    ‘To be honest, I’ve had enough.’

g. Ofta (så) vet man inte vart man ska vända sig. (Aspectual adverb)
    often SÅ know one not where one should turn SELF
    ‘Often you don’t know where to turn.’
h. Därför (så) kan du gå nu. (Conjunctive adverb)
   therefore SÅ can you go now
   ‘That’s why you can go now.’

i. Trots allt (så) var det en lyckad semester. (Conjunctive adverb)
   after all SÅ was it a successful holiday
   ‘It was a pleasant holiday, after all.’

j. Tvärtom (så) ska du tvätta dem i kallt vatten. (Conjunctive adverb)
   on the contrary SÅ shall you wash them in cold water
   ‘On the contrary, you should wash them in cold water.’

Så is also very commonly used with topic-shift expressions, as in (20) (Egerland 2013, Holmberg, to appear).

(20) a. Vad äpplena beträffar (så) får ni gärna ta av dem.
   what the apples concern SÅ can you well take of them
   ‘As for the apples, you can just take some.’

b. Apropå takplattor (så) vet jag var du kan få dom billigt.
   as for roof tiles SÅ know I where you can get them cheaply
   ‘As for roof tiles, I know where you can get them cheap.’

Since these as for-phrases are clearly externally merged in the C-domain, not moved from IP, I argue in Holmberg (to appear) that they can be externally merged with FinP, checking V2. If the D-Force which is spelled out as så is merged, they move from there to merge with ForceP. Alternatively, they can be externally merged in the Frame-field, with no interaction with V2 or så. This seems slightly more natural with (20b) than (20a) (see Egerland 2013).
(21) Apropå takplattor, jag vet var du kan få dom billigt.

as.for roof tiles I know where you can get them cheaply

‘As for roof tiles, I know where you can get them cheap.’

An interesting exception is negation. The sentential negation can be fronted in Swedish, but cannot co-occur with så.

(22) Inte (*så) vet jag nånting om deras planer.

not SÅ know I anything about their plans

‘I don’t know anything about their plans./Don’t ask me about their plans.’

This is true for fronted negative adjuncts in general (see Heino 1984).

(23) a. Ingenstans (*så) kan man byta kläder.

nowhere SÅ can one change clothes

‘You can’t change anywhere.’

b. Aldrig (*så) får man höra ett dugg.

never SÅ can one hear a drizzle

‘You never get to hear anything.’

This is all predicted by the theory including (11), according to which så is a spell-out of the features [-Top,-Foc], an ‘anti-Topic’ and ‘anti-Focus head. It will not attract arguments (DPs, CPs, or PPs), as arguments in the C-domain are topics (except the subject, see below). It will not attract predicates, since the fronted predicates are topics, too, more specifically
contrastive topics. A natural continuation of, for example (13c) is …men jag kan bli kassör ‘but I can be treasurer’. It will not attract wh-phrases, as they are focus-operators (Rizzi 1997).

The definition of focus that we need here is: \( \alpha \) is Focus if \( \alpha \) binds a variable in IP. That IP contains a variable means that it does not denote a proposition but a set of alternative propositions, identical except for the value of the variable. A fronted whP binds a variable but does not assign a value to it. The answer particles, as mentioned, are focused. They are focused by virtue of binding a polarity-variable in IP, to which they assign positive or negative value.

According to Holmberg (2016) every finite sentence is headed by a polarity feature which is inherently unspecified, positive or negative, \([\pm Pol]\), hence is a variable. A negation will assign negative value to the polarity variable. In the absence of negation, the polarity feature is assigned \([+Pol]\) by default. In yes-no questions the polarity variable remains a variable, assigned a value in the answer. The answer to a yes-no question is typically made up of a copy of the IP of the question, containing the polarity variable, merged with an answer particle in focus position. The answer particle assigns a value, either positive or negative, to the variable.

Finally, the fronted negation and negative adjuncts are polarity-focus elements, binding and assigning negative value to the polarity variable in IP.

The categories that do occur with \( så \) would thus have in common that they have neither topic nor focus function. The prediction is right in the case of the various fronted adverbs that like to occur with \( så \). It seems blatantly false, though, in the case of the \( as\text{-}for \) phrases, whose function is specifically to introduce a new topic or re-introduce an old topic. The way to see it may be that, in the case of the \( as\text{-}for \) phrase, the formal topic feature of the relevant constituent is checked/valued internally to the phrase, so the \( as\text{-}for \) phrase itself does not have a Top-feature, and as such can be attracted by the D-Force head spelled out as \( så \).

It is unclear what the hypothesis predicts for fronted adverbial clauses, like the conditional clause in (19a) or the temporal clause in (24):
(24) När det blir vinter, (så) far vi till södern.  
when it becomes winter SÅ go we to south  
‘When winter comes, we go South.’

This looks like a topic-comment relation. I put this case aside for further research.\textsuperscript{12}

The hypothesis also makes a blatantly false prediction for subjects. It predicts that the subject could be attracted by så, as the subject which checks V2 in Fin as a default device need not have any topic or focus function. It can even be an expletive pronoun, yet it cannot occur with så. This remains a problem in the theory articulated here.

4. \textbf{On the meaning of så}

Nordström (2010) ascribes a semantic function to så: “så [...] is a relational predicate that introduces a new point of departure in the discourse by relating the proposition in its complement to the constituent in its specifier.” This characterization does accord with some of the constructions where så is used. It accords particularly well with the \textit{as-for} topic construction, as in (20a,b). It also accords well with the use of så in connection with preposed adjunct clauses, as in (20a), where, as mentioned, så is highly natural. The conditional clause in the specifier of så provides the background for the proposition in the complement, and the whole expression can be characterised as presenting a new point of departure. And it accords well with the semantics of clauses with a preposed conjunctive adverb, such as (19j), repeated here as (25).
(25) Tvärtom (så) ska du tvätta dem i kallt vatten.

on the contrary SÅ shall you wash them in cold water

‘On the contrary, you should wash them in cold water.’

(25) can be described as presenting a point of departure which is new in relation to the understood contrary proposition. With a bit of imagination this characterisation can be extended to the other sentences with conjunctive adverbs in (19). But in all these cases så is optional. An alternative analysis is that the conjunctive adverbs themselves serve to introduce a proposition conveying a new point of departure, with or without så.

I would maintain that the role of så in all the examples listed above in (19), (20), and (21) is purely formal, not contributing anything to the semantics or pragmatics of the sentences, which is, indeed, why it can be omitted.¹³

5. Så as default checker of V2

There is one case where it does look like så checks the EPP of Fin. Consider (26):


you can cook porridge or you can fry egg or you can just toast a pair bread.slices

b. Du kan koka gröt, *(så)* kan du steka ägg, *(så)* kan du bara rosta ett par brödsrivor.

you can cook porridge or SÅ can you fry egg or SÅ can you just toast a pair bread.slices
‘You can make porridge, or you can fry some egg, or you can just make some toast.’

In (26b) så is obligatory, in the sense that either there is movement of the subject to check the EPP of Fin, as in in (26a), or the particle så is merged. This can be understood if (a) the conjunction eller ‘or’ is incapable of checking the EPP of Fin, because it is a head merged high in the C-domain, or even outside of the C-domain, not a maximal category moved from IP, and (b) så can serve as a default checker of the EPP of Fin after all, in certain contexts.

That is to say, uninterpretable så in Swedish comes in two guises: Either it is the spellout of a variety of D-Force, or it is merged with FinP as a default checker of the EPP of Fin.

Consider also the conjunction och ‘and’ in (27):

(27) a. Du kan koka gröt, och du kan steka ägg, och du kan rosta ett par brödskivor.
    
    you can cook porridge and you can fry egg and you can toast a pair bread.slices

b. Du kan koka gröt, och *(så) kan du steka ägg, och *(så) kan du rosta ett par brödskivor.
    
    you can cook porridge and SÅ can you fry egg and SÅ can you toast a pair bread.slices

‘You can cook porridge, and you can fry some egg, and you can make some toast.’
I would claim that (27b) also has an instance of expletive så checking the EPP of Fin, as an alternative to moving a phrase (the subject) to FinP, as in (27a). There is a reading where så in (27b) means ‘subsequently/then’, but there is also a reading where it is expletive. Under that reading (27a,b) are semantically and pragmatically identical. In (26), with eller ‘or’, the expletive reading is the only reading.

6. Fenno-Swedish

Fenno-Swedish, the family of dialects of Swedish spoken in Finland, has a number of syntactic properties which sets it off from most or all dialects spoken in Sweden. One of them is that the V3 particle så is much more widely used. On the face of it, almost any initial constituent can occur with så. All the examples in this section are Fenno-Swedish.\(^{14}\)

(28) a. Till exempel reseskildringar så tycker jag att är väldigt intressanta.
for example travelogues SÅ think I that are very interesting
‘I think that travelogues, for example, are very interesting.’

b. Både grodor och paddor så simmar ut till holmar i skärgården.
both frogs and toads SÅ swim out to islets in the archipelago
‘Frogs and toads both swim out to islets in the archipelago.’

c. Toaletten så är här till höger och rakt fram.
the.toilet SÅ is here to the.right and straight ahead
‘The toilet is to the right and straight ahead.’
In these examples så occurs with an initial argument. This seems to be particularly common when the initial argument is aboutness topic and somewhat heavy. Unlike the situation in other varieties of Swedish, it can also appear in wh-questions, particularly (and perhaps exclusively) adjunct questions, as in (29) or questions with a D-linked wh-phrase, as in (30).

(29)  

(29)  a. **När så** far vi nästa gång till Paris?

when SÅ go we next time to Paris
‘When are we going to Paris next time?’

b. **Var så** sa du att du int vill sitta?

where SÅ said you that you not want sit
‘Where did you say that you don’t want to sit?’

c. **Äh, varför så** kunde jag int va å knacka i sovrumstaket före jag

oh why SÅ could I not be to knock in the bedroom.ceiling before I

lade Frida?

put.to.bed Frida

‘Oh, why didn’t I knock in the bedroom ceiling before putting Frida to bed?’

(30) Vilken av dom här reseskildringarna så tycker du att är intressantast?

which of these here travelogues SÅ think you that is most interesting

‘Which of these travelogues do you think is most interesting?’

It seems considerably less natural in the bare, argument questions in (31).

(31) a. Vem (*så) talar du med?

who SÅ talk you with

‘Who are you talking to?’

b. Vilket nummer (*så) tänker du välja?

which number SÅ intend you choose

The answer particles do not occur with så, even in Fenno-Swedish.

(32) Vill du komma med?

want you come along

‘Do you want to come along?’

a. Ja det vill jag.

yes it want I

‘Yes I do.’

b. *Ja så vill jag (det).
Topicalized predicates with så were accepted by most informants after some hesitation. This is indicated by a question mark

(33) a. Spela piano (?så) kan han nog.
   play piano SÅ can he indeed
   ‘Play the piano, he can, indeed.’

b. Sportig (?så) är han int.
   sporty SÅ is he not
   ‘He’s not sporty.’

c. Ordförande (?så) vill jag helst int bli.
   chairperson SÅ want I rather not become
   ‘I would rather not be chairperson.’

Like Standard Swedish, Fenno-Swedish does not allow så with a fronted negation, or (though less clearly) with fronted negative arguments or adverbs.

(34) a. Int (*så) vet jag vad man kan göra.
   not SÅ know I what one can do
   ‘I don’t know what you can do.’

b. Ingenting (*så) får man veta.
   nothing SÅ may one know
   ‘They don’t tell you anything.’

c. Ingenstans (?så) har man sett något vargspår
   nowhere SÅ have one seen any wolf.tracks
   ‘Nobody has seen wolf tracks anywhere.’
There is a sentential, modal particle *nog* which is more common in Fenno-Swedish than in Standard Swedish, and characteristically occurs in fronted position. It can be loosely characterised as encoding affirmative emphasis. It does not occur with *så*.

(35) Nog (*så*) vet jag vad han vill.

NOG SÅ know I what he wants

‘I do know what he wants.’

A way to understand this is if *så* in Fenno-Swedish is anti-focus but not anti-topic. More precisely, while *så* in Standard Swedish (and other varieties of Mainland Scandinavian, as far as we know) is the spell-out of the feature bundle (36a), *så* in Fenno-Swedish is the spell-out of (36b).

(36) a. [D-Force, -Top,-Foc, EPP] [Standard Swedish]
b. [D-Force, -Foc, EPP] [Fenno-Swedish]

This will rule out *så* with the answer particle in Fenno-Swedish. It will also rule out fronting of negative constituents, which are focus by virtue of assigning a value to the sentential polarity variable (Holmberg 2016). It will allow fronting of the topic arguments in (28). We can understand the wh-movement facts if we allow for an additional movement of (certain) adjunct wh-phrases and d-linked wh-phrases from FocP to ForceP.

Consider the following observation, and compare it with (30).
Av de här reseskildringarna så vilken tycker du att är intressantast?

Which of these travelogues do you think is most interesting?

This can be analysed as derived by subextraction of the PP [av de här reseskildringarna] from the complex wh-phrase [vilken av de här reseskildringarna] ‘which of these travelogues’, moving it to the spec of ForceP, headed by så, as depicted in (38).

(38)  \[\text{ForceP PP så [FocP [vilken PP] [FinP [vilken PP] Fin [TP ... [vilken PP] ... ]]]}\]

Considering the fact that (37) and (30) are exact synonyms, an alternative to subextraction is, in Fenno-Swedish, to move the whole whP, but with ‘scattered deletion’ applying in LF, such that the wh-word in (30), albeit pronounced there, is not interpreted in the specifier of ForceP position, but in the specifier of Focus position. I have indicated this by capitalizing the copy of the wh-word in the lower, interpreted position in (39), representing the derivation of (30). The highest copy merged with ForceP would thus be spelled out as overt but lack interpretation.

(39)  \[\text{ForceP [vilken PP] så [FocP [VILKEN PP] [FinP [vilken PP] Fin [TP ... [vilken PP] ... ]]]}\]

This could be extended even to cases like (29a,b,c), if adjunct wh-phrases have a covert NP, which can undergo movement to ForceP headed by så. (40) would be the structure of (29a).

(40)  \[\text{ForceP [när TIME så [FocP [NÄR TIME] [FinP ['när TIME] Fin [TP ... [när TIME] ... ]]]]}\]
‘Pure operator’ wh-items would not have an NP component which would be allowed in the spec of ForceP headed by the [-Foc] feature spelled out as så.

7. When så and copy-left-dislocation do not have complementary distribution

Consider the following examples of Fenno-Swedish:

(41)  a. Den här boken så den har en ovanlig bakgrund.

this here book SÅ it has an unusual background

‘This book has an unusual history.’

b. Toaletten så den är här till höger, och rakt fram.

the.toilet SÅ it is here to the.right and straight on

‘The toilet is on the right here, and then straight on.’

c. Hur det sen gick med företaget så det vet jag ingenting om.

how it then went with the.enterprise SÅ it know I nothing about

‘How the enterprise managed later, I know nothing about.’

This is ostensibly V4: the initial phrase is followed by så and a proform, and then the finite verb. Is the initial phrase internally or externally merged? Is the proform the Topic head or a fronted coreferent pronoun? The test from the possessive reflexive gives an indication: The initial phrase can be moved from IP.

(42)  (Vad med hans barn? ‘What about his children?’)

a. Sin, dotter så henne har han, nog inte sett på flera år.

his.REFL daughter SÅ her has he PRT not seen for many ears
b. Hansdotter så henne har han, nog inte sett på flera år.

‘His daughter he hasn’t seen for many years.’

The possessive reflexive is well formed in (42a), which indicates that the DP containing it has moved from within IP, ensuring that the reflexive possessive is bound by the subject (see Holmberg, to appear). The possessive pronoun in (42b) can also be coreferential with the subject, which indicates that the initial DP can, alternatively, be externally merged as a hanging topic. Reconstruction of the DP with the possessive pronoun, as if it had moved, would yield a Principle B violation. It should be noted, though, that these are preliminary findings, based on the judgments of a handful of informants. Under the movement analysis, the structure of, for example (41a) would be (43).

(43) Tree after References

That is to say, in this case the agreeing Top head would be dissociated from D-Force, and co-occur with så spelling out D-Force. The topicalised DP would move first to FinP, checking V2, then to TopP, valueing its uϕ-features, and finally to D-ForceP, spelled out as så.

There are still more complications, though. Consider (44).

(44) Sebastian så vet ni var han sitter?

‘Sebastian, do you know where his place is?’
In this case the initial DP, followed by så and the finite verb, has a resumptive pronoun in IP. That is to say, the initial DP is not moved from IP. What is even more puzzling is that the sentence is a yes-no question, meaning that the Force here is not declarative. It also means that the EPP of Fin is checked in whatever way it is generally checked in yes-no questions; neither så nor the initial DP are needed for this purpose. This suggests that the initial DP is a hanging topic, in which case the function of så is not that in (39). I leave this construction for future research (see note 15). There is clearly still more to say about the use of Fenno-Swedish så.

8. Summary

The Mainland Scandinavian ‘V3 particle’ så occurs in the C-domain of root clauses, typically between an initial adjunct and the finite verb. It is argued, following Eide (2011), that the particle is a head, an exponent of declarative Force, made up of the features [D-Force, −Top, −Foc, EPP]. This entails that the particle wants a specifier which is neither Topic nor Focus.

There is another variety of så, a phrasal category in the C-domain, introducing a root clause conjoined by the conjunction eller ‘or’ or och ‘and’. In this case the particle ‘checks V2’, i.e. satisfies the EPP of Fin, as an alternative to fronting the subject.

In Fenno-Swedish så has a wider distribution, occurring also with topicalized arguments. The only categories which clearly do not occur with så are fronted pure operators, including the negation, affirmative particle nog, and bare wh-words.
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3 At one time it used to be called contrastive left-dislocation, misleadingly, as contrast is not a defining property of the construction.
4 ForceP can be embedded as a complement of the high complementiser which introduces so-called embedded root clauses, as in (i).

(i) Han sa att troligen så är det ingenting.  
   he said that probably SÅ is it nothing
   ‘He said that probably it’s nothing.’

(ii) Det är klart att sportig det är han inte.  
    it is clear that sporty that is he not
    ‘Clearly, he is not sporty.’

The notion of Force here is therefore not the one assumed in Rizzi (1997), where the high complementiser would be an exponent of Force, but closer to the one assumed in Haegeman (2004, 2010, 2012). Force in this sense is illocutionary force, a property of root clauses and certain types of embedded clauses only.

5 Matters are complicated by the fact that så can co-occur with då ‘then’ in what looks like copy-left-dislocation (as pointed out Johan Brandtler, pers. comm.), except that the prosody indicates otherwise.

(i) I morgon, då så har vi öppet som vanligt.  
   tomorrow then SÅ have we open as usual
   ‘Tomorrow we are open as usual.’

The proform då cannot have the unstressed form typical of the Topic head. See Eide (2011) for discussion. I take it that this construction is a case of an adverbial externally merged in the Frame-field, with då moved from within TP to the spec of Force realized as så.

6 Elisabeth Engdahl (pers. comm.) claims that (16c) is grammatical for her, and has found the following example in Nordic Dialect Corpus:

(i) frillesas_om3
så att det finns ju mycket att berätta egentligen för att då sextioåtta ja så
so that there is PRT much to tell actually because then sixty.eight PRT SÅ

blev det organiserat hamnjobb för oss här i Frillesås
were there organized harbour.work for us here in Frillesås

‘So there is much to tell, actually, because back in sixty-eight they organised work in the harbour for us here in Frillesås.’

This could indicate that så can be used as a default checker of V2, after all, in some contexts (not just the ones to be discussed in section 5), for some speakers.

7 (16c) can be interpreted as a yes-no question, which is irrelevant here.

8 There is an additional answer particle in Scandinavian, namely jo, which is a polarity-reversing particle, like German doch and French si: It disconfirms the negative alternative of a negative question (Farkas and Bruce 2009, Holmberg 2016: 167). Like ja and nej it is a focus-particle in the C-domain.

9 Elisabet Engdahl (pers. comm.) provides the following example of a fronted predicate which is new information focus, a rare occurrence but not impossible.

(i) Eva heter jag, och jag ska vara er guide idag.
Eva is.called I and I will be your guide today

‘My name is Eva, and I will be your guide today.’

10 The fronted arguments can be contrastive, but need not be. They may just introduce a new topic or may be continuing topics.

11 Johan Brandtler (pers. comm.) points out that assuming the distinction between sentence topics and framing topics in Chafe (1976:50), the generalization would be that så can co-occur with framing topics but not with sentence topics. As for-phrases would qualify as framing topics, given this distinction. Chafe’s framing topics tend not to be classified as
topics in current cartographic theory, although their framing function is acknowledged, as they populate the Frame field. I assume the more restricted definition of topic here.

12 Possibly the topic in (24) is not the temporal clause but the DP ‘winter’, checked within the temporal clause, As such, the temporal clause itself would not have a topic feature, and would thus be attractable by så.

13 Salvesen (to appear) claims that the C-particle så is not actually optional in spoken Norwegian, but is used consistently, at least in some contexts. This, I take it, is not because there has been any change in the semantic properties of the particle, but is a case of low-level variation in a spell-out rule.

14 Some of the sentences in this section have been observed in use, in spoken Fenno-Swedish. Some are made up and checked with other speakers of Fenno-Swedish, but only a small number, so far. The ScanDiaSyn database (https://tekstlab.uio.no/nota/Scandiasyn) includes data from the construction (a fronted object DP with så) from 611 locations in Norway, Sweden, and Finland, mostly with four speakers per location. In Norway and Sweden there are a few scattered locations where the construction is accepted or at least not completely ruled out by most or all speakers. In Finland it is uniformly accepted in all the nine investigated locations. There is presumably variation in Fenno-Swedish regarding the details of the construction, though. A systematic investigation remains to be done. All the examples except the citation (29c) retain standard Swedish spelling, except that the negation has the Fenno-Swedish monosyllabic form.

15 All the sentences in this section except (42a,b) have been observed in use. It is by no means clear how widely they are accepted, though, by speakers of Fenno-Swedish. Personally, I would reject (44), for example.