

HJALMAR P. PETERSEN

Convergence in Faro-Danish

1. Introduction

Faro-Danish, sometimes also called *Gøtudanskt* (lit.: Street-Danish, as it is called by people on the islands), is a highly proficient L2 Danish spoken on the Faroe Islands, where the first language of the inhabitants is typically Faroese. According to Poulsen (1998), the term *Gøtudanskt* originated with a teacher from the village of Gøta. This teacher spoke a certain variety of Danish that showed numerous Faroisms.

Faro-Danish is understood here as a highly proficient L2 Danish spoken on the Faroe Islands with Faroese interference at all levels of language processing. The younger generation has a better command of Danish pronunciation, whereas the older generation mainly speaks Danish as it is written (a mild form of a spelling pronunciation) and use, to a large extent, phonological features typical of Faroese such as preaspiration and unvoiced *n* and *l* in front of the aspirated plosives *p*, *t* and *k* as in *alt* [aɫ̥] ‘all’. The reason for this is that the older generation has learned Danish mainly through the medium of writing, whereas the younger generation is exposed to spoken Danish in television and computer-games and thus from an early age. In addition, teachers today emphasise correct pronunciation to a larger extent than they did previously.

Characteristics of Faro-Danish are, among other things, (i) intra-sentential code switching (singly occurring words), (ii) embedded islands, (iii) inter-sentential code switching, (iv) convergence, (v) nonce borrow-

I would like to thank K. Braunmüller and one reviewer for comments on this paper, A. MacDougall for correcting the English.

Petersen, H. P., dr. phil., Sonderforschungsbereich Mehrsprachigkeit, Universität Hamburg. “Convergence in Faro-Danish”, *ANF* 124 (2009), pp. 165–185.

Abstract: The data presented in this article show that convergence in Faro-Danish does not occur at random, nor is it the case that anything is possible. On the contrary, the data lends support to the 4-M model and the Abstract Level model. It also clearly shows that both grammars are ‘on’ in bilingual speech.

Keywords: convergence, language contact and replication.

ings, (vi) pronominal gender, (vii) congruent lexicalization in lexical borrowings and (viii) word internal mixing (Petersen 2008). The emphasis of this article is, as indicated in the title, convergence.

This paper is organized as follows: in section (2) the term “convergence” is defined and the 4-M model and the Abstract Level model are presented. The methodology of this project is also briefly explained (3), after which I proceed to the data, which is presented in three main sections: semantic convergence (4), morphological convergence (5) and syntactic convergence (6). In the discussion section (7) I will discuss the data in terms of the 4-M model and the Abstract Level model. Both were developed by Myers-Scotton and Jake to account for language contact phenomena such as convergence, attrition and code-switching. For more detail on these models the reader is referred to Myers-Scotton (2002, 2006) as well as Jake & Myers-Scotton (1997).

2. Convergence, the 4-M model and the Abstract Level model

Convergence is defined by Myers-Scotton (2002) and (2006) as (bold face in original):

[...] speech by bilinguals that has all the surface-level forms from one language, but with **part of the abstract lexical structure** that underlies the surface-level patterns **coming from another language** (or languages).

(Myers-Scotton 2006: 271)

Our hypothesis is that restrictions are placed on attrition, convergence and code switching. These constraints are according to different morpheme types and with regard to the level of the structures – that is, if we are dealing with a lexical-conceptual structure, predicate-argument structure or morphological realization patterns (for further details see below). Morpheme types and the level of realization are capable of predicting what is allowed and what is banned from converging in language contact.

According to the 4-M model, morphemes are divided into four different types according to the Different Access Hypothesis. To put it simply and focusing on what is relevant for our data, morphemes that are accessed earlier – content morphemes and early system morphemes – may come either from the Matrix Language or the Embedded Language

in language contact. Morphemes that are accessed later – bridge system morphemes and outsider system morphemes – only come from the Matrix Language. I will discuss the morpheme types in greater detail below.

Content morphemes add and receive theta roles. They are verbs, nouns, adjectives and some adverbs and discourse markers. When it comes to English prepositions, Myers-Scotton classifies some of these as content morphemes, some as early system morphemes, and some as late system morphemes (Myers-Scotton 2002: 72).

Early system morphemes (ESM) add conceptual information to the relevant content morphemes. Among ESM are plurals, present and past participles, verb + particles, infinitives, definite articles and possessive pronouns.

Both content morphemes and early system morphemes exhibit a conceptual structure. They encode the speaker's intentions, and are salient in the Mental Lexicon and they are the elements, according to Myers-Scotton (2002), sending directions to the Formulator for further production. Because of their relation with conceptual structure, they are the types of morphemes that are prime candidates to spread from one language to another.

In code-switching content morphemes and early system morphemes may come from either the Matrix Language or the Embedded Language. As the citation shows, these two morpheme types should be more susceptible to convergence than late system morphemes, which are divided into: bridge system morphemes and outsider system morphemes. An example of a bridge system morpheme in English is *of* in *a book of John*. Bridge system morphemes occur between phrases that make up a larger constituent (Myers-Scotton 2006: 269).

Typical examples of outsider system morphemes are agreement and tense. Outsider system morphemes depend on information outside of the element with which they occur, and they are by definition more resistance to change than the former.

The hierarchy put forward in Myers-Scotton (2002: 231) is as follows: Late system morphemes < early system morphemes < content morphemes. This means that late system morphemes are more susceptible to change than early system morphemes and content morphemes.

According to the Abstract Level model, all lemmas consist of three levels of abstract lexical structure in the Mental Lexicon. These levels are Lexical-conceptual structure (semantic and pragmatic information), Predicate-argument structure (the mapping of thematic structure onto

syntactic relations) and Morphological realization patterns (surface realizations of grammatical structures) (Myers-Scotton 2002: 19, 194).

Predicate-argument structure is “least susceptible to modification in attrition and lexical-conceptual structure is most susceptible” (Myers-Scotton 2002: 196).

If this is so, the K8 Corpus at Hamburg University on Faro-Danish bilingualism should show few predicate-argument structures coming from Faroese, some morphological realization patterns – those that are early morphemes – and a larger number of lexical-conceptual structures. The hierarchy is as follows: Predicate-argument structure < morphological realization patterns < lexical-conceptual structure (Myers-Scotton 2002: 231).

In order to test this hypothesis I have counted the number mixed-collocations and idioms found in the K8 data and nonce-borrowings. These represent lexical-conceptual structures and content morphemes. I then looked at morphological realization patterns such as word order change and plurals. The latter is an early system morpheme and should be sensitive to changes in language contact.

3. Methodology

The data used in the study was collected as part of a larger research project in Faroese-Danish bilingualism which is presently being conducted at the Research Centre 538: Multilingualism at the University of Hamburg.

The project is divided into two parts: (i) Danish in spoken Faroese and (ii) Faroese interference in Danish as a L2 on the Faroe Islands. We will present data from the Danish corpus in this article.

The Danish data are based on 24 informal interviews that were conducted by a native speaker of Danish on the Faroe Islands in the summer of 2006. As the interviewer neither spoke Faroese nor understood it at all, the informants needed to speak Danish with her.

The informants spoke about different topics, such as the Second World War (the older generation), books they had read, films, confirmation, school, children’s games and everyday life. The informants belonged to two different generations, either from 70+ or between 16 and 20. Further, they came from different dialectal areas, as we wanted to see if these two factors play any role in their Danish. This turned out not being the case.

The data were transcribed in *Praat* and are part of a larger data-base on Faroese-Danish bilingualism. Most of the informants are the same ones who were interviewed for the Faroese corpus the year before. We managed to obtain almost but not all of the same informants, as some of the younger participants had left for Denmark while others were on holiday during the interview period, etc.

Some of the older informants exhibited a greater number of intra- and inter-sentential code-switches. This was presumably caused by different factors such as memory, how much and how often they were exposed to Danish or whether the person simply forgot that they were speaking to a Dane.

Only after the whole corpus has been carefully analyzed can we definitely determine how salient these differences between the generations are and if they are of any significance.

4. Semantic convergence

As the Faroese and Danish languages share a common ancestry and have been in contact with one another for centuries, many homophonous diamorphs, cognates, homonyms and synonyms are found in both languages.

In (1a) the speaker activates the meaning of Faroese verb *slæppa* [slɛhp:a] ‘be allowed to’, which is nearly homophonous to the Danish *slippe* [slɛbø] ‘let go’. The target is the (1b) sentence, and homophony is the trigger for the semantic convergence.

The speaker’s intended meaning of (1a) is that he will not be allowed to go back to the sea. What he actually says does not make sense.

- (1a) Men nu er det ikke sikkert, at jeg **slipper** ud at fiske igen. (K8)
 but now is it-nom. not sure that I-nom. let go-1.p.sg. out to fish-inf.
 again
 ‘But now is it not sure that I let go to fish again’.
- (1b) Men nu er det ikke sikkert, at jeg **får** lov til at fiske igen. (Dan.)
 but now is it-nom. not sure that I-nom. am allowed to to-inf. fish again
 ‘But now is it not certain if I will be allowed to go back to fish again’.

A very common semantic convergence occurs with the Danish verb *at synes* ‘to think, suppose’, based on Faroese *at halda* ‘to think; to believe’, as in (2a), where the Danish target is *at tro* or *at mene* ‘to believe’.

- (2a) Der er omkring tredive, fyre mennesker, **synes jeg**. (K8)
 (2b) Tað eru umleið tredivu, fjøruti fólk, **haldi eg**. (Far.)
 there are about 30, 40 people-nom., I-nom. think
 ‘There are about 30 or 40 people, I believe.’

I found seven tokens of this use of the verb by the younger generation and one by the older generation.

The Faroese verb *at fara* ‘to move; to go; to travel...’, which denotes, among other things, MOVEMENT TOWARDS A PLACE OR TRAVELLING TO A PLACE, while the Danish language would use *tage til* ‘travel to’ or *rejse til* to denote the same thing.

The Faroese meaning is reflected in (3a), in which the speaker activate the Danish lemma *at gå* ‘to walk’ instead of the expected Danish targets *at tage til* ‘to travel to, to go to’ or *rejse til* ‘travel to’, based on Faroese *at fara* ‘to move; to go; to travel’.

- (3a) Jeg ønsker at gå til Kalifornien. (K8)
 I-nom. wish to walk to California-obl.
 (3b) Eg ynski at fara til Kalifornia. (Far.)
 I-nom. wish to go-inf. to California-acc.
 ‘I intend to go to California.’

17 tokens of this verb were observed to be uttered by the young speakers and seven by the old speakers.

Cognates may also trigger semantic convergence. In (4) the speaker intends to say that he needs to see the ocean near his home. The Faroese noun is *sjógvur* ‘sea, ocean’, and he activates this lemma, which results in the incorrect Danish cognate: *sø* ‘lake’ instead of the intended Danish noun *hav* ‘ocean’. I was able to find three tokens with this particular use of Danish *sø* in our data base.

- (4a) ...fordi jeg vil gerne se **sø** og fjeld og sådan noget... (K8)
 ...because I-nom. will as a rule see lake-obl. and mountains-obl. -pl. and such things
 (4b) ...tí eg vil fegin síggja **sjógv** og fjøll og sovordíð... (Far.)
 ...because I-nom. will as a rule see sea-acc. and mountains-acc.-pl. and such things
 ‘...because I need, usually, to see the ocean and mountains and so on’.

The last example for semantic convergence that I would like to mention are the synonyms *heitur* ‘warm’ and Danish *varm* ‘warm, hot’. In Faroese

it is possible to use *heitur* meaning ‘irritated’. This meaning is extended to *varm* in (5b) below, where the Danish target is *når man er ophidset* ‘when one is irritated’ or perhaps Danish *bed* ‘irritated’.

- (5a) Når man er **varm**. (K8)
 (5b) Tá mann er **heitur**. (Far.)
 ‘When one is heated.’
 (5c) Når man er **ophidset**. (Dan.)

There are also examples of mixed collocations and idioms which I have not included in this paper for lack of space. I can mention, however, that 22 types and 40 tokens were observed, until now, in the speech of the older generation and 11 types and 12 tokens in the speech of the younger generation. In terms of nonce-borrowings, 37 were used by the young informants and 61 by the older informants.

5. Morphological convergences

I have found five types of morphological convergences in the material: (i) plurals, (ii) past participles, (iii) plural of adjectives (rare), (iv) past tense *-edes*, (v) comparatives and superlatives. In (6a), the speaker, a young boy from Tórshavn, uses the Faroese plural *-skib* (Far. *skip*) instead of the Danish *-skibe* ‘ships’. The Danish suffix *-e* is missing, based on the Faroese plural *skip-Ø*.

- (6a) Det er trawlere og sådan noget, **fiskeskib**. (K8)
 (6b) Tað eru trolarar og sovorðið, **fiskiskip**. (Far.)
 there are trawlers-nom.pl. and such things, fishing-ships-nom.pl.
 ‘There are trawlers and such, fishing-ships’.

[Danish target: fiskeskibe].

Collectively the younger speakers expressed four types/tokens with a Faroese plural in their Danish speech: *fiskeskib* < Far. *-skip*, target: *fiske-skibe* ‘fishing-ships’, *procenter* < Far. *prosentir*, target: *procent* ‘per cents’, *kurser* < Far. *kursusir* ‘courses’, target: *kursus* and *musikkbander* < Far. *-bólkar* ‘bands’, target: *-bands*. Of these *kursus* might have the plural *kurser* in Danish, while *procent* may have the plural *procenter*, but I count at least *kursuser* ‘courses’ as an underlying Faroese plural, as the speaker corrects herself and says that ‘you [Danes] say *kursus*, eh?’.

The older informants showed 9 types and 12 tokens of the Faroese plural. One of these types is the noun *skib* instead of *skibe* ‘ships’ (seen 2 times), cf. above by the young informants.

Adjectives are additionally found in plural form, though I only found three types and four tokens. One example is the adjective *tryg* instead of Standard Dan. *trygge* ‘safe’. Two tokens were found with the adjective *gammel* ‘old’ with the Danish target *gamle* ‘old’, while another was found in *vi er meget glad-Ø for* ‘we are very happy for’ instead of *glade* ‘happy [pl.]’. Here Faro-Danish *glad* is based on Faroese *glað*. The Danish target is *glade* ‘happy’.

(7a) Æhm, det er meget stille og meget **tryg** omgivelser. (K8)

(7b) Ehm, tað er ógviliga stilt og ógviliga **trygg** umgivilsir. (Far.)

hmm, it-nom. is very quiet and very safe-nom.pl. surroundings-nom.pl.
‘Hmm, these surroundings are very quiet and very safe’.

[Danish target: *trygge* ‘safe’].

In (8a) we see an example of the use of *gammel* ‘old’ in the K8 Corpus.

(8a) ...før de bliver meget **gammel**. (K8)

(8b) ...áðrenn tey blíva ógviliga **gomul**. (Far.)

...before they-nom.pl. become very old-nom.pl.
‘...before they become very old’.

[Danish target: *gamle*].

The Far. adjective *gamal* ‘old’ has the plural form *gomul* in the nominative and accusative of neuter of the strong declination. It corresponds with Standard Danish *gamle* ‘old’ in the plural. When the speaker uses *gammel* in (8a) is it because the underlying form is Faroese *gomul* ‘old’.

The past participle is expressed with *-t* in Modern Colloquial Danish as in *kommet* ‘arrived’ and so forth (Christensen & Widell 2001: 85). Faroese exhibits different past participle endings depending on the verb class (Thráinsson et al. 2004, Petersen & Adams 2008). Ignoring the details, I shall merely mention that the past participle of strong verbs is *-in* as in *komin* ‘arrived’, and it is this suffix that is activated in (9a). I was only able to find one example with *-en* among the members of the younger generation, whereas seven types and eight tokens were attested by the older generation. Cognates such as the Danish *kommet* are typical, which is mixed with the Faroese *komin*, resulting in the Faro-Danish *kommen*.

An example with a past participle is presented below. In the Faro-

Danish sentence (9a) the speaker uses the suffix *-en*. It is not the Faroese *-in* ending but rather an accommodation of *-in* as *-en* in Faro-Danish, which is based on the Faroese verb *dottin* ‘fallen’ and the Danish verb *faldet* ‘fallen’.

- (9a) Jeg var **falden**, og havde brækket armen. (K8)
 (9b) Eg var **dottin**, og hevði brotið armin. (Far.)
 (9c) Jeg var **faldet**, og havde brækket armen. (Dan.)
 I-nom. was fallen, and had broken arm-the-acc.
 ‘I had fallen, and had broken the arm’

According to the 4-M model, one would not expect to find an underlying Faroese past tense in Faro-Danish. But I have examples with the suffix *-ede*, where it is not supposed to be according to Standard Danish. This is surprising in the sense that tense (and agreement) are outsider system morphemes and should not be among the prime candidates for the spread in a language contact situation.

The verbs are presented in the table below, in which the past tense suffixes in Faro-Danish, Danish and Faroese are written in bold face. Three of the verbs are strong verbs in standard Danish: *forstod* ‘understood’, present tense *at forstå* ‘to understand’; *gad* ‘liked (to)’, infinitive *at gide* ‘to like (to)’; and *frøs* ‘froze’ from one informant of the older generation, infinitive *at fryse* ‘to freeze’.

‘Wrong’ past tense. Younger generation:

Far.-Dan.	forståede	visede	sagdede	bestemmede	gadede
Dan.	forstod	viste	sagde	bestemte	gad
Far.	forstöðu	vistu	søgðu	bestemmaðu	
	‘understood’	‘showed’	‘said’	‘decided’	‘liked to’

‘Wrong’ past tense. Older Generation:

Far.-Dan.	frysede (2 tokens)	kaldede
Dan.	frøs	kaldte
Far.	frystu	kallaðu
	‘froze’	‘called’

Far.-Dan. is an abbreviation of Faro-Danish.

There appears to be no connection between Faroese *forstöðu* ‘understood’, Danish *forstod* and Faro-Danish *forståede* ‘understood’. The

same holds for Far. *vístu*, Standard Dan. *viste* and Faro-Danish *visede*, Far. *segði*, Dan. *sagde* and Faro-Danish *sagdede*, etc.

The explanation is relatively straight-forward, however, and it is one of analogical levelling.

Basically two suffixes exist in the past tense in the weak declination in Faroese verb inflection. Sg./pl. *-aði/-aðu* (pronounced: [ajɪ] and [avu]) and *-ti/-tu* (allomorphs: *-di/-du*; *-ddi/ddu*, Petersen 2001)). Of these, the *-aði/-aðu* suffixes of the first inflection of the weak verbs are productive as witnessed by loanwords and historical changes. That is: loanwords enter automatically this class, and a strong verb like *bjóða* ‘to invite’ with the past tense *beyð* ‘invited’ changes to *bjóðaði* ‘invited’ instead of *beyð* ‘invited’. The ending corresponds synchronically (and mostly also historically) with *-ede* in Danish and the Old Norse *ō*-verbs. As the suffix is productive, the past tense of the verb-inflections above is not unexpected. Note that the endings have the Danish form *-ede*, not the Faroese [ajɪ] and [avu].

The last morphological convergences I found in the material were a comparative and two superlatives. The comparative is *nærere* ‘nearer’. The target is Danish *nærmere* and is based on Faroese *nærri*. Two superlative forms were also found: *højste* ‘highest’, where the target is Dan. *højeste*. Here the *-e* is deleted according to Faroese *hægsti* ‘highest’. The other superlative is *meget lettest*, ‘easiest’, which is in fact a Faroese collocate: *nógv lettast*, where the target actually is Danish *lettest*.

6. Syntactic convergence

In this section I would like to show examples of V2 in embedded clauses, verb in final position, supine attraction, compounded and un-compounded verbs, double definiteness, lack of the definite pronoun, PP + DP, de-venitive constructions and possessive constructions. It will become clear that the abstract structure underlying these constructions comes from Faroese, as they are impossible in Standard Danish.

Standard Danish uses the construction *adverb + verb* in embedded clauses. In Icelandic, however, the string is, after bridge and non-bridge verbs, *verb + adverb*. Faroese allows both the *adverb + verb* and the *verb + adverb* string after bridge verbs as well as after non-bridge verbs, as seen in Petersen (2000), Thráinsson (2004) and Thráinsson *et al.* (2004: 438ff.), all of whom noted that Faroese has independently developed a

system with both Mainland Scandinavian *adverb + verb* and Insular Scandinavian *verb + adverb* structures.

This is exactly what we would expect of language contact, as replication is not merely the copying of structures from the model language (Heine & Kuteva 2005: 81, Thomson & Kaufman 1988: 62).

Given the distribution of *verb + adverb* in Faroese, the sentences below are not unexpected. The Faro-Danish sentence in (10a) with *vil ikke* 'will not' is based on Faroese *vil ikki* 'will not'. The target is Danish *ikke vil* 'not will'. The informant speaks about an American preacher and remarks that he is:

(10a) En meget interessant mand, som mange mennesker **vil ikke** høre om. (K8)

(10b) Ein ógviliga áhugaverdur maður, sum nógv fólk **vilja ikki** hoyra um. (Far.)
a very interesting man-nom., who many people-nom. **will not** hear about.

'A very interesting man, who many people do not want to hear about'

In (11a) the informant, a young woman, speaks about gymnasts that she coaches. She says that she is going to tell them that if they really want to be good, they have to train. She uses *verb + adverb* twice in *vil virkelig* 'want really' and *vil gerne* 'want really', based on Faroese *vilja veruliga/vilja gjarna* 'want really, want really'. The Danish target is *virkelig vil/gerne vil*.

(11a) Man vil fortælle dem, at hvis de **vil virkelig, vil gerne** være gode gymnaster ... (K8)

(11b) Mann fer at fortelja teimum, at vissi tey **vilja virkuliga, vilja gjarna** verða góðir fimleikarar ... (Far.)

one-nom. wants to tell them-acc. that if they-nom. **will really, will really** like to be good gymnasts ...

'One will tell them that if they really want, very much want to be good gymnasts ...'

In (12) another informant talks about a movie she saw. It is about a man who has lost a lot of money. The string *kan ikke* 'can not' is based on Faroese *kann ikki* 'can not'. The Danish target is *ikke kan* 'not can'.

(12) ...så bliver han dræbt, fordi han **kan ikke** give pengene tilbage. (K8)

...then becomes he-nom. killed, because he-nom. **can not** give money-the back.

'...then he is killed, because he cannot give the money back'

Verb in final position is possible in Faroese as seen in (13a) and (13c), with these serving as models for the corresponding Faro-Danish sentences (13b) and (13d). The Danish target in (13b) is ...*hvor der var meget af is* 'where there was much of ice'. The target of (13d) is ...*som var gammelt færøsk* '...that was old Faroese'.

- (13a) ...men tað var eitt av teimum støðunum, har (sum) nógv av ísi **var**.
(Far.)
- (13b) ...men det var et af de steder, hvor meget af is **var**. (K8).
... but it was one of the places where much-nom. of ice **was**
'...but it was one of the places, where there was much ice'
- (13c) Tey gera ikki annað, ella, tey gera ikki tað, sum gamalt føroyskt **var**.
(Far.)
- (13d) De laver ikke andet, eller de laver ikke det, som gammelt færøsk **var**.
(K8)
they-nom. do not other, or they do not it, that old-nom. Faroese-nom.
was
'They are not doing anything else, or rather, they are not performing the old Faroese custom'

Faroese, Norwegian and Swedish dialects in Jämtland exhibit supine attraction or supine spreading, in which an infinitive changes to a supine as a result of the supine in the preceding main verb as seen in (14) (Sandøy 2001: 140). The main verb has the regular supine form *verið*, which is required after *hevði*. The supine of *verið* spreads to the other verbs, so that *at sleppa* 'to be allowed to' changes to *at sloppið* 'to be allowed to' and *at halda* 'to hold around' changes to *at hildið* 'to hold around'.

- (14) Tað **hevði verið** stuttligt, **at sloppið at hildið** um eina gentu einaferð.
it had-past. been-sup. nice to be allowed-sup. to hold-sup. around a girl-acc. once
'It would have been nice to once be allowed to put one's arms around a girl'
(Sandøy 2001: 140).

Supine attraction is a phenomenon that is completely unknown in Danish. The following two examples were found in my data. One is from a girl who spent one year in a Danish school and thus has a good command of Danish. The target is in both cases Danish *at arbejde*, not **at arbejdet* 'to work'.

- (15a) Jeg har prøvet **at arbejdet** på en café. (K8)
 (15b) Eg havi prøvað **at arbeitt** á einari kafe. (Far.)
 I-nom. have tried-sup. to work-sup. on a café
 'I have tried to work in a café'
- (15c) Jeg har prøvet **at arbejdet** indenfor restaurant... (K8)
 (15d) Eg havi prøvað **at arbeitt** innanfyri restaurant... (Far.)
 I-nom. have tried-sup. to work-sup. in for restaurant...
 'I have tried to work in a restaurant'

Many compounded verbs used in Faroese are borrowed from Danish. This is also the case in Icelandic, but there are also cases in which the speakers use *verb* + *particle* corresponding to a Faroese satellite construction. I found four types and five tokens in the speech of the younger informants and five types/tokens in the speech of the older generation. (16) offers an illustrative example, where *give ud* 'to publish' is based on the Faroese *verb* + *particle* construction *geva út* 'to publish'. The Danish target is *udgive*, Lit.: out+give 'to publish'. This use of *give ud* to mean 'publish' in Danish is somewhat old-fashioned according to *Ordbog over det Danske Sprog* (available on the Internet: <http://ordnet.dk/ods/>).

- (16) Han har **givet** så meget **ud**. (K8)
 he-nom. has given-ppp. so much out-prt.
 'He has published so much'

One difference between Faroese and Danish is that Faroese (in addition to Icelandic, Norwegian and Swedish) allows for double definiteness. In, for example, the English and Danish *the big man/den store mand*, the noun *mand* does not have a definite article as it would in Faroese, *maðurin*. The Danish DP *den store mand* 'the big man' corresponds to *tann stóri maðurin* in Faroese, which literary means *the big man-the*.

The young speakers have 2 types and 3 tokens with this construction, and the old generation 2 types and 4 tokens, which indicates that the informants have a relatively good command of Danish. Note that the two examples in (17a) and (18a) are a bit suspicious, as they are fixed expressions. The Danish target of (17a) is: *Det lovede land* 'the Promised Land' with no article on the noun.

- (17a) til **Det** lovede landet. (K8).
 (17b) til **Tað** lovaða landið. (Far.)
 to the-acc. promised-the land-the-acc.
 ‘to the Promised Land’

The other example from the younger generation is presented in (18a), in which the speaker discusses the Old Testament. Note that he does not use a definite article; I will return to why this is the case below. The corresponding Danish phrase must have the definite article *det* ‘the’ and no definite ending *-t*.

(18c) is from a man from the older generation, where he speaks about a trip with a trawler to the Canary Islands. He also has no definite article.

- (18a) Sà, det var Gamle Testamentet. (K8)
 (18b) So, tað var Gamla Testamentið. (Far.)
 So, that was old-nom.-the testament-the-nom.
 ‘So that was the Old Testament’
 (18c) Vi var inde i Kanariske øerne. (K8)
 (18d) Vit vóru inni á Kanarisku oyggjumum. (Far.)
 we were in on Canary Islands
 ‘We were on the Canary Islands.’

[Danish target: så, det var det Gamle Testamente; vi var inde på De kanariske øer].

How could it happen that (18a) and (18c) lack the definite article *det* ‘the’? Faroese allows either *tað Gamla Testamentið* (lit.: ‘the Old Testament-the’) or a DP with no definite article but with a definite ending: *Gamla Testamentið* (lit.: ‘Old Testamente-the’). The same holds for *tær Kanarisku oyggjarnar* (lit.: ‘the Canary Islands-the’) and *Kanarisku oyggjarnar* (lit.: ‘Canary Islands-the’).

It is possible to start a new sentence or discourse in Faroese with a definite phrase, as in:

- (19) **Amerikanski forsetin** fór til Kina í gjár.
 American president went to China yesterday
 ‘The American president went to China yesterday’

If both the speaker and the listener know that the entity spoken about is one of a kind, the definite article may be deleted; as there is only one

American president, the definite article *tann*, ‘the’, is left out in (19) in Faroese (Petersen 2002). This is exactly what we have in Faro-Danish with the example of (18a) *Gamle Testamentet*, ‘Old Testament’, as there is only one Old Testament. The same happens when a woman of the older generation speaks about *Nýggja Testamentið* (lit.: New Testamente = ‘The New Testament’). This phenomenon is again observed in (18c) when the speaker refers to the Canary Islands as *Kanariske øerne* ‘Canary Islands-the’, not the Standard Danish *De kanariske øer* ‘The Canary Islands’.

There are six types and 33 tokens of prepositions in the data. These convergences do not happen at random, as the same prepositions are converged by both generations.

(20a) Hvis man ikke bliver tvunget til det **for** skolen. (K8)

(20b) Vissi mann ikki verður noyddur til tað **fyr**i skúlan. (Far.)

if one-nom. not is forced-ppp. to it **because** school-acc.

‘If one is not forced to do it because of the school’

[Danish target: **på grund af skolen** lit.: on ground of school-the-obl. ‘because of the school’].

(21a) Jeg går **på** møde. (K8)

(21b) Eg gangi **á** møti. (Far.)

I go on meeting

‘I go to a religious meeting’

[Danish target: **til møde** ‘to a religious meeting’].

(22a) Så, vi har været **i** skiferie. (K8)

(22d) So, vit hava verið **í** skiferiu. (Far.)

so we-nom. have been in ski holiday

‘So we were on a ski holiday’

[Danish target: **på skiferie** ‘on ski holiday’]

In (24a) below the speaker uses *med* ‘to’, instead of Danish *til* ‘to’. The reason for this confusion is that the Old Norse *med* ‘with’, and the Old Norse *við* ‘with’, merge in Faroese to *við* ‘with’. But that is not the whole story, as the correct preposition should be the Danish *til* ‘to’, which corresponds to the Faroese *til* ‘to’. The use of *við* ‘to’ in (24a) is not surprising, however, as DIRECTION can be expressed with *við* ‘to’ + accusative in Faroese (Barnes 1994) as in (23).

- (23) Hann segði tað **við meg**. (Far.)
 he said it with me-acc.
 'He said it to me'

A sentence such as (23) would correspond to Danish *til mig* 'to me'. In (24a) the speaker relates how someone told another person something.

- (24a) Og så sagde han **med en anden dreng**, han sagde ikke noget **med mig**,
 men han sagde det **med en anden**... (K8)
 and then said he-nom. with another boy-obl., he-nom. said nothing with
 me-obl., but he-nom. said it with another-obl.
- (24b) Og so segði hann **við ein annan drong**, hann segði einki **við meg**, men
 hann segði tað **við ein annan**... (Far.)
 and then said he-nom. with another boy-acc., he said not anything with
 me-acc., but he-nom. said it-nom. with another-acc.
 'And then he said to another boy, he did not say anything to me, but he
 said it to another boy...'

[Danish target: *til en anden dreng* 'to another boy', *til mig* 'to me', *til en anden* 'to another']

As ON. *við* and ON. *með* 'with' merge to *við* in Faroese, we would almost expect that the informants would use Danish *ved* 'near, nearby; at; on' incorrect. That is, they use Danish *ved* instead of Danish *med* 'with', but this *ved* is based on Faroese *við* 'with'. This is exactly what happens in (25a), uttered by a girl from the younger generation as she tells the interviewer that she could take a guided tour with a smack called *Norðlýsið*, 'the Northern Lights'.

- (25a) Man kan tage **ved Norðlýsið**. (K8)
 one-nom. can go with Northern Lights-obl.
- (25b) Mann kann fara **við Norðlýsinum**. (Far.)
 one-nom. can go with Norðlýsið-dat.
 'One might sail with the [smack] Northern Lights'
 [Danish target: *med Norðlýsið* 'with Northern Lights']

(25a) is also interesting in other ways, first its use of the preposition *ved* and then the name *Norðlýsið*. As a name it is code-switched to Faroese, but the case is accommodated so that the Faroese dative is changed to a Faroese accusative in order to make it look more Danish, which would be *Nordlyset*.

A last example with a preposition is with *til* ‘to’.

(26a) ...og da jeg ikke trænede, da skulle jeg **til arbejde**. (K8)

(26b) ...og tá eg ikki trenaði, tá skuldi eg **til arbeiðis**. (Far.)

...and when I-nom. not trained, then should I-nom. to work-gen.

...and when I did not train, then I had to go to work’.

[Danish target: **på arbejde** Lit.: on work]

The expression *til arbeiðis* in Faroese is a collocate and one of the few phrases/items that shows a relict of the Old Norse genitive, which is expressed with the *-s* suffix in (26b).

There are two Gram families¹ in Europe which employ a certain construction for expressing the future by means of the verb ‘to come’ (Dahl 2000: 320), the Mainland Scandinavian languages and Romansh dialects. Note that Faroese is usually classified as an Insular Scandinavian language, although there are many exceptions to this grouping. It is more appropriate to say that Faroese is a Mid-Scandinavian language that moves closer and closer to the Mainland Scandinavian languages, as is seen, for example, in impersonal passive constructions such as *bleiv (tað) dansað í gjár?* (lit.: ‘was (there) danced yesterday’). The expletive is obligatory in Mainland Scandinavian though impossible in Icelandic. Both constructions are allowed in Faroese. Language contact has resulted in a system in Faroese that allows for more choices or more different patterns with respect to some structures.

The de-venitive constructions are expressed as in (27) in Mainland Scandinavian:

(27)	kommer	til(l)	at(t)	<full verb>
	come-INF	to	INFM	

I was able to find examples of the informants speaking Faroese and using de-venitive. They were not merely copying the Danish *komme til at* ‘come to to-inf.’, however, but rather deleting the preposition *til*, resulting in: *koma at + infinitive of full verb* in Faroese.

When Faroese speakers speak Danish, they may use the replicated structure as in:

¹ *Gram families* is used “for grams with related functions and diachronic sources that show up in genetically and/or geographically related groups of languages” (Dahl 2000: 317).

(28a) Men når man **kommer at kende** andre folk... (K8)

(28b) Men tá mann **kemur at kenna** onnur fólk... (Far.)

but when one-nom. comes-3.p.sg. to know-inf. other people-acc.

‘But as one comes to know other people...’

[Danish target: **kommer til at kende** andre folk...Lit.: when one comes to to know other people]

The ON. genitive does not exist in colloquial Faroese (Thráinsson et al. 2004, Petersen & Adams 2008). Possession is typically expressed with a *hjá* ‘with’, as in (29), where the thing being possessed is found in the nominative definite form (*bilurin* ‘car-the’) and the possessor in the dative definite form (*manninum* ‘man-the-dat’).

For details on the use of constructions as seen in (29) and possessive pronouns in general see Barnes (2002).

(29) Bilurin hjá manninum. (Far.)

car-the-nom. with man-the-dat.

[thing possessed – possessor]

‘the man’s car’

I only found three examples with this construction in the Faro-Danish data. Two are from the same speaker of the younger generation and one from an older speaker, and as that of the older speaker is a bit suspect, I am inclined to rule it out.

In (30) the speaker explains how they found human bone at an excavation and remarks that:

(30a) ...og der var også **ben hos mennesker**. (K8)

and there were also bone-nom. with people-obl.

(30b) og har vóru eisini **bein hjá fólkum**. (Far.)

and there were also bone-nom. with people-dat.

‘and there were also people’s bones’

[Danish target: menneskeknogler ‘people’s bone’]

7. Discussion and conclusion

Examples such as those of supine attraction, *verb + adverb* and the prepositions show very clearly that both languages are active in bilingual language production and that both grammars are ‘on’.

The data show that convergence does not occur at random. This is not a case in which anything goes – quite on the contrary, in fact.

One good candidate, when it comes to linguistic models that are capable of predicting convergence (attrition and code-switching) is the 4-M model as developed by Jake and Myers-Scotton (1997) and the Abstract Level model. The data above confirm the hierarchies put forward in Myers-Scotton (2002: 231), stating that late system morphemes are more resistant to change in language contact than early system morphemes and that content morphemes are easily borrowed. It also indicates that predicate-argument structures are least susceptible to modifications followed by morphological realization patterns that are followed by lexical-conceptual structures, which are easily borrowed.

We have shown examples of content morphemes. All in all, if we count nonce-borrowings, mixed collocations and the semantic convergences, content morphemes clearly outnumber early system morphemes, which again outnumber the outsider system morphemes.

If we count these morphological realization patterns together with word order, we then get the following picture:

	Young		Old	
	Types	Tokens	Types	Tokens
Plural	4	4	9	12
Verb + prt.	4	5	5	5
Past Part.	1	1	7	8
Verb + Adv	1	1	5	5
Verb final			1	1

If we consider definite articles to be early system morphemes – after all, they add conceptual information to the relevant content morphemes – the numbers above increase with the following types and tokens 2/3 (young) and 2/4 (old), which then includes the example with *Kanariske øerne* (lit.: canary islands-the ‘the Canary Islands’) with no definite article, which is allowed in Faroese and transferred to Faro-Danish, under certain discourse readings.

Note that there is essentially no difference between the younger and older speakers with regards to convergence of early system morphemes. This is not to say, however, that no differences exist at all. Such a conclusion could first be reached following a detailed analysis of occurrences of code-switching, embedded islands, nonce-borrowings and flagging. It might well be the case that some older speakers show more instances of flagging, for example, a case of code-switching, which could be taken as

an indicator of proficiency, although we need to keep in mind that other factors such as memory may also be the reason for this.

Most prepositions in Faroese are early system morphemes, as they add conceptual information to the following DP. Prepositions seen in the material are *for* ‘because of’ (20a), *på* ‘to’ ~ Far. *á* + movement towards a place in (21a), *i* with the intended meaning ‘on’, based on Far. *í* ‘on’ + being on a place (dat.) in (22a). Then there is *med* ‘to’, based on Faroese *við* ‘to’ + direction (acc.) in (24a), and *ved*, where the meaning is based on Far. *við* + ‘instrumental’ as in (25a) and (25b), and the use of *til* + movement towards a place, cf. (26a).

The de-venitive constructions confirm what Heine and Kuteva (2005: 81) said about language replication – compare also Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 62). Language replication is not merely a matter of copying.

In the de-venitive constructions, the Danish *komme til at* ‘come to -Inf.’ is replicated in Far., as *koma at* ‘come to-Inf.’, with the omission of the preposition *til* ‘to’. When Faroese speakers speak Danish, their first L2, they use the replicated Faroese construction and say *komme at* ‘come to-inf.’ (28a).

Bridge system morphemes come from the Matrix Language only. In this case we assume the Matrix Language to be Danish, and that is why it is strange to find the possessive construction in (30a), as *bjá*, just as with *of* in English, is a bridge morphemes. It is worth noting, however, that only this one example was found and it might well be the case that the speaker was either tired or that his command of Danish is not particularly good. Note also that he is the youngest of them all.

In summary, the data at hand confirm the two hierarchies established in Myers-Scotton (2002: 231). The 4-M model in addition to the Abstract Level model are both capable of predicting what can and cannot be converged in language contact.

References

- Barnes, M. P. 2002. “Head + modifier or modifier + head?”. Anfinnur Johansen, Zakaris S. Hansen, Jógvan í Lon Jacobsen and Malan Marnersdóttir (eds.), *Eivindarmál*. Heiðursrit til Eivind Weyhe á seksti ára degi hansara 25 apríl 2002. Tórshavn: Fróðskaparfelag Føroya, pp. 59–66.
- Barnes, M. P. 1994. “Nýggjar hugsanir um fyrisetingina við í føroyskum”. *Málting* 10, pp. 23–36.
- Christensen, C. B. & Widell, P. 2001. *Nudansk Grammatik*. København: Politikens Forlag.

- Dahl, Ö. 2000: "The grammar of future time reference in European languages". Ö. Dahl (ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 309–327.
- Heine, B. & Kuteva, T. 2005: *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jake, J. & Myers-Scotton, C. 1997: "Codeswitching and Compromise Strategies: Implications for Lexical Structure," *International Journal of Bilingualism* 1, pp. 25–39.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 2002: *Contact Linguistics. Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 2006: *Multiple Voices. An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Petersen, H. P. 2000: "IP or TP in Modern Faroese". *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 66, pp. 75–83.
- Petersen, H. P. 2001: "Hovedverber i færøsk: en studie af ordstadiet". *Norsk lingvistisk tidsskrift* 19, pp. 3–28.
- Petersen, H. P. 2002: "Diskursgreining av bundnum lýsingarorðum". Anfinnur Johansen, Zakaris Svabo Hansen, Jógvan í Lon Jacobsen & Malan Marnersdóttir (eds.), *Eivindarmál*. Heiðursrit til Eivind Weyhe á seksti ára degi hansara 25 apríl 2002. Føroya Fróðskaparfelag: Tórshavn, pp. 282–293.
- Petersen, H. P. 2008: "Væk af vejen, konge skrejen: Dano-Faroese or Gøtudanskt". *Rask* 28, pp. 43–53.
- Petersen, H. P. & Adams, J. 2008 (in press): *Faroese Grammar for Foreigners*. Tórshavn: Stiðin.
- Sandøy, H. 2001: "Færøsk i vestnordisk språkhistorie". Kurt Braunmüller & Jógvan í Lon Jacobsen (eds.), *Moderne lingvistiske teorier of færøsk*. Oslo: Novus, pp. 125–154.
- Thomason, S. G. & Kaufman, T. 1988: *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley, LA, Oxford: University of California Press.
- Thráinsson, H., Petersen, H. P., Jacobsen í Lon, J. & Hansen, Z.S. 2004: *Faroese. An overview and Reference Grammar*. Tórshavn: Føroya Fróðskaparfelag.
- Thráinsson, H. 2004: "Um sagnbeygingu, sagnfærslu og setningagerð í færeysku og fleiri málum". *Íslenskt mál* 23, pp. 7–70.

