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Summary

The questions examined here are whether Icelandic is a de-accenting language like English, or if there is a tendency towards re-accenting as in some of our neighbouring languages, such as Swedish? Data was gathered from two sources: Firstly from RÚV radio newscasts, to ascertain whether re-accenting is at all common in Icelandic and to show examples of this. Secondly, from the use of an intonation survey by Alan Cruttenden which was translated put before 13 native Icelandic speakers to give some intimation of the relative frequency of de-accenting vs. re-accenting.

The results turned out to be somewhat mixed. The RÚV data indicates that re-accenting is indeed common, at least in the register newsreaders use, and that given the same syntactic constructions in which an English-speaker would tend to de-accent, Icelandic-speakers will generally re-accent instead. The survey data is less clear, but indicates that Icelandic aligns roughly with Cruttenden's results for languages with a strong tendency towards re-accenting, like Swedish and Spanish. There were also some indications that age and gender has a correlation with the frequency of de-accenting in Icelandic, with young and male subjects tending to re-accent less.
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1. Introduction

As compared to other fields within modern linguistics, the study of intonation has achieved relatively little in the way of sweeping theories that comprehensively explain various aspects of intonation-related phenomena. In contrast to the more illustrious fields of syntax, morphology and segmental phonology, many aspects of intonation remain both uncertain and little investigated. Intonation is the means by which meaning is shaped for what would otherwise be ambiguous syntactic constructions; it is the method we use to convey our feelings and attitudes towards each other in conversation, and it is the way we emphasize what we feel is important and de-emphasize what we feel is not. In other words: Intonation is not about what one says, it is about how one says it (Cruttenden, 2006:1-4).

Quite a lot of work has been done on the intonation of the English language but, as of yet, no framework that suffices to explain all aspects of the role of intonation in communication has been put forward. Among other things, this has quite a lot to do with intonation's close ties to semantics, which has proven to be one of the facets of language that least lends itself to systematic investigation. Studies of intonation have been quite varied, but nonetheless tend to fall into one of two camps: the very general, broad, and shallow kind, and the super-specific, narrow, but deep. The former type of study often does a good job of explaining those intonational phenomena which are controlled by syntactic parameters, but generally restrict themselves in the amount to which they are willing to delve into phenomena which are semantic in nature to a greater extent. The second, more narrowly focused kind of intonational study which one tends to find, has its very own problems. While they're more likely to take into account the factors which the broader studies are prone to ignoring, these studies often suffer for a lack of context into which to plug their findings.

All of the above also applies to research into Icelandic intonation, but compounded greatly by the scarcity of studies. Magnús Pétursson's 1979 article on Icelandic intonation is an excellent example of the narrow kind of study mentioned above. His study was very limited in scope and its results were not applicable to anything until a broader survey had been conducted. It was not until 1993, when Kristján Árnason published such an article, that something started happening in the field. Kristján's work has subsequently prompted a few other scholars to start looking into the matter.
The choice of subject for this particular essay was prompted by my instructor, Pétur Knútsson, who had noted that a certain intonational phenomenon that English does not allow, known as re-accenting (Cruttenden, 2006), is something which occurs routinely in Icelandic. Therefore, the question under discussion here is the status of re-accenting of given information in Icelandic. Is it a feature that all speakers share? Is its counterpart, de-accenting a feature in the language?

This particular essay is to a certain extent an extension of a survey by Alan Cruttenden (2006) where he tested the status of de-accenting in various languages. Part of the data-collection for this essay indeed consisted of applying his survey to Icelandic and thus seeing where Icelandic stands in that context. The other material I collected came from radio news broadcasts, which were chosen for the consistency of news anchors’ intonation patterns, as anyone who has fallen asleep over the radio weather forecasts can testify.

It must be noted that during the later stages of writing, I came upon a conference paper by Francis Nolan and Hildur Jónsdóttir in which they discuss the same subject as I am doing here, and come largely to the same conclusions. I shall be comparing my results to theirs; seeing where they might agree and where they might differ. These two studies will be referenced often and will hopefully provide the context in which the results gathered here can be applied.
2. About intonation and de-accenting

2.1. Concepts, terminology and notation
Before venturing into the realm of actual speaker data, it will be necessary to clear up some of the terminology and concepts that will be used. Due to the lack of a dominant research paradigm for intonation studies, there are several quite different competing methods of presenting and interpreting results, and in the course of this chapter, I will briefly explain the one used in the context of this essay.

De-accenting and re-accenting will come to be the core terms used here, but to understand them, one must first understand the concept of the nucleus, as it is used in the so-called English school of phonetics. It is the most common approach in contemporary British intonational studies, and it has yielded some excellent literature on intonation in English as a whole, principally by J.C Wells and Alan Cruttenden. The nucleus is the unit upon which all the major pitch changes in an utterance revolve. As a way of modelling intonation it is derived from research into English, but the underlying assumption seems to be that the concept is not exclusive to English as a useful way of analysing intonation. To name an example, in Cruttenden's chapter on “New and old information” in his 1997 work Intonation, he makes no reference to the variability of this kind of de-accenting between languages (81). Neither does Wells in his treatment of the subject (2006:109-111). Both scholars assume that the nucleus generally never falls on an old item of information.

This nucleus, also known as the tonic syllable, is the element that gives any utterance its intonational contour, and is generally the most prominent pitch contour in any intonation phrase; hereafter referred to as an IP (Cruttenden 1997:42) It is the means by which a speaker is able to differentiate between the meaning of sentences like these:

(1) This essay is rather dull.
(2) This essay is rather dull.

In these examples, the nucleus is placed upon the word that is in bold letters. This is indeed, together with italics, an extremely common typographical way to signify what amounts to marked nuclear placement, both in fiction and in writing more generally. Obviously, that does not mean that when we use typographical means like these to show emphasis, we are aware that we are altering nuclear placement. We are simply finding a
means to make the words on the page carry the same meaning as what we hear in our heads and that is one of the chief roles of intonation.

The first sentence above is unmarked and has broad focus. That is, if an English-speaker were asked to utter this phrase without being given any context for it, that is almost certainly the form that would be used. The defining feature of broad focus sentences is the fact the the nucleus is usually placed on the last stressed syllable of the utterance. (Wells 2006:116) The second one is rather different. It displays what is called narrow focus. In that one, a specific essay is being compared unfavourably to another one, and the method by which that is implied is non-terminal nucleus placement.

Icelandic, like English and most other languages whose intonation has been studied so far, places the nucleus by default on the last stressed lexical unit of an IP. (Cruttenden 1997:42) This is the most common and least marked pattern of nucleus placement. However, in English there are a lot of cases where the nucleus can or must be moved up in the sentence; or, to put it another way, the word which would under normal circumstances be accented must be de-accented. There are two broad categories of de-accenting: semantic de-accenting, and grammatical de-accenting. In the case of the former, the nucleus is shifted around in a sentence to change its meaning and to narrow its focus, as is done in the two examples above.

However it is for the most part the latter category, grammatical de-accenting, which is under discussion here, and this brings us to the heart of the matter. Under quite a few circumstances, most varieties of English will not allow the nuclear stress to fall upon the last lexical item of an IP as it would normally do, given sentences containing entirely new information. The most common of these, and the one with the most relevance to languages other than English, occurs in those cases where the lexical item on which the nuclear stress would normally fall represents information that has already entered the context of the discourse. ¹

Up until the 1990's (Cruttenden, 2006: 5), such de-accenting was widely thought to be a universal phenomenon, or at least the less marked option as opposed to its counterpart – re-accenting; i.e., keeping the accent on the last lexical item of an IP in circumstances where English, and other languages that share the same tendency, would not. The question had only been studied in the context of English and the assumption was that, at

¹See examples 3, 4 and 5 below.
least until proven otherwise, it made semantic sense not to put an accent on the same information twice. By not re-accenting, the semantic focus of any utterance is kept firmly upon any new information being presented.

Of course, Icelandic doesn't necessarily fall neatly into such a neat de-accenting/re-accenting dichotomy; Alan Cruttenden's small study of the phenomenon in several languages shows that there seems to be a spectrum of de- versus re-accenting in those languages that he studied, although none of the languages seem to entirely disallow de-accenting. Many of them, to a greater or lesser degree, seemed to allow both patterns; though often with one preferred over the other.

This concept of the nucleus that I'm working with is not universally accepted. It is mainly a feature of the English school of intonation studies which I previously mentioned. Kristján Árnason, who has done the greatest amount of work on Icelandic intonation, for example, works within the ToBI (Tones and Break Indices) system, which was originally developed by Janet Pierrehumbert. (Pierrehumbert & Hirschberg, 1990) That system, as Wells describes it, “rather than analys[ing] intonation patterns in terms of pitch contours (rise, fall, fall-rise, etc.) it breaks them down into components, basically High and Low in various combinations” (2006:261). [original emphasis]

Those using the ToBi system do not attempt to analyse the most prominent pitch accents in a sentence as being governed by a unit such as a nucleus, but instead opt for a more minimalist descriptive approach. They do, however use a similar conception of what an Intonation Phrase is, what its role is and how it tends to correspond to a language's syntax.

I will not attempt to analyse the intonation patterns of Icelandic with the ToBi system as Kristján Árnason does. Instead, following the example of J.C. Wells and Alan Cruttenden, I shall consider every IP to have a unit called a nucleus that the intonation patterns of any IP all revolve around. That is something that Kristján does not assume. Therefore, though I shall make references to his interpretation of Icelandic intonation, they are unlikely to be entirely compatible with the interpretation I shall be using here.

The system of notation that will be used here to show intonation patterns is based on that used in Pétur Knútsson's courses on English intonation. His system, though it essentially agrees with Cruttenden's, uses a different notation which can be used in-line with the subject text, unlike Cruttenden's pictorial representation of intonation contours. It
provides a transcription of intonation which, though ignoring details of non-nuclear pitch alterations, shows well the division of an IP into head, pitch-carrying nucleus, and tail.

*Table 1: Pétur Knútsson’s notation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>7</th>
<th>`</th>
<th>12</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>High head</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nucleus w/low fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Low head</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nucleus w/high rise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>Tail</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nucleus/low rise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>IP boundary marker</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nucleus w/fall-rise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Utterance boundary marker</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>Nucleus w/high fall</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nucleus w/unspecifed tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These symbols (except 4-5) are only applied only to words capable of taking sentence stress, so they’re generally not applied to various function words, pronouns, et cetera. Symbols 1-2 are used to mark the stressed syllables of the head; 3 is applied to the stressed syllables of the tail; 4 shows division of an utterance into IPs; 5 indicates longer pauses; 6-11 are put on the nucleus and indicate its tone; and 12 is simply a nucleus marker with no associated tone, used for analysing written texts where various tones might apply.

Though this system was designed with English in mind, it is at least provisionally applicable to Icelandic. Individual pitch contours may not function the exact same way in both languages; for example, the fall-rise contour does not seem to occur in Icelandic. I will nonetheless proceed on the assumption that each IP is comprised of the same basic ingredients: The pre-head (not marked using these symbols, which are only applied to stressed syllables), the head, the nucleus and the tail.

**2.2. Studies of Icelandic intonation**

The intonation of Icelandic has been little studied and the research is therefore relatively easy to sum up. Sveinn Bergsveinsson made the first and one of the most ambitious effort in his 1941 work, *Grundfragen der isländischen Satzphonetik*, where he devotes a substantial chapter to sentence stress and intonation. Despite the depth and breadth of his studies on the subject, the usefulness of his work was limited by the fact that, being stuck

---

2 Also used for stresses in a written (unspoken) head, unspecified for high/low
in wartime Germany, he had no Icelandic speakers available to study, other than himself, and was quite cut off from other scholars studying modern Icelandic linguistics, relatively few as they may have been at the time. His work was also hampered by the fact that the tools needed to make accurate measurements of intonation were largely non-existent at the time, making it difficult and time-consuming to get any results beyond the entirely subjective judgement of the researcher. I do not build upon his analysis at all, as his research is both old and tallies poorly with the current mainstream of Icelandic linguistics.

As far as I have been able to ascertain, the only other scholar to make any inroads into Icelandic intonation before the more recent period of increased attention to the subject, is Magnús Pétursson. In 1978, he published a short but interesting article called "Nokkur hljómfallsform, er gefa til kynna þagnir í íslenzku," or 'Several Intonation Patterns Which Indicate Pauses in Icelandic.' There, he effectively details the different kinds of nuclei found in Icelandic, though he doesn't define them as such; or as anything in particular other than precisely what the title of the article says: intonation patterns commonly found before pauses.

Kristján Árnason has made the most groundbreaking efforts to tackle the subject, most notably in an article in Íslenskt Mál from 1994 called “Tilraun til greiningar á íslen-sku tónfalli,” and a chapter on Icelandic intonation in Íslensk tunga I, which is largely based upon the research undertaken for the aforementioned article. He, like Sveinn Bergsveinsson, mostly used his own pronunciation as a guide. To my knowledge, there have been only two Icelandic intonation studies in which any other speaker data were collected; a 2008 B.A. thesis by Þórdís Steinarsdóttir, in which she looks into the matter of intonational dialects in Icelandic, which was supervised by Kristján and works within his framework; and Nolan and Jónsdóttir's study, which will come to play a large part in this essay. Nicole Dehé has also published several articles during the last few years, dealing with Icelandic intonation in greater detail. Her approach builds upon Kristján Árnason's findings and, like him, she uses the ToBi framework.

From the viewpoint of this essay, by far the most important piece of recent research on Icelandic intonation is the paper published by Francis Nolan and Hildur Jónsdóttir in 2004. There they present the results of a study on the status of de-accenting in Icelandic, quite similar to what is being done here. Unlike the Kristján Árnason's research, and that of those who followed in his wake, they approach Icelandic in the same way as is done here and assume that every IP must have a nucleus, the same as in English. The research
was conducted in a similar way to that described in the latter part of this essay. In their study, four Icelandic-speakers and four English-speakers read examples where given information was repeated in a setting that would provoke de-accenting. (191)

As expected, none of the English subjects re-accented, except for a small minority that would do so in cases of hypernym substitution. The Icelandic subjects, however, did so consistently in every scenario that was tested. As I pointed out in the introduction, this paper was not known to me until quite late in the process of writing this essay, but given its relevancy to the subject at hand, I will be using it for comparison throughout.

2.3. De-accenting and re-accenting in English and other languages

De-accenting is a more-or-less obligatory feature of most varieties of English, including Received Pronunciation and General American English. There are varieties where de-accenting does not seem to be important, for example Hawaiian English (Cruttenden 2006, 7), but those will not be taken into account here. An example from Wells (2006:108) shows quite clearly that de-accenting is not an optional feature in English:

(3)  How a\textsuperscript{1}bout a \textsuperscript{1}gin and \textsuperscript{x} tonic?\textsuperscript{3}

This question shows the standard broad-focus placement of the nuclear pitch accent but in the answer, since \textit{tonic} is again placed in an IP-terminal setting, the speaker is obliged to shift the nuclear accent up (or to the left) to the next lexical item.

(4)  Oh I'd pre\textsuperscript{1}fer a \textsuperscript{x} vodka and \textsuperscript{•} tonic.

vs.

(5)  \textsuperscript{*}Oh I'd pre\textsuperscript{1}fer a \textsuperscript{1}vodka and \textsuperscript{x} tonic.

The next lexical item available happens to be \textit{vodka}, so the nucleus is placed there. (5) is not from Wells' example, but is there simply to show that re-accenting is unacceptable in this context.

According to the results of Cruttenden's intonational survey, many languages have far less strict rules about de-accenting than English does. Re-accenting is generally common in the Romance languages. Though de-accenting also appears to be an option, the intonational grammar of the language doesn't seem to require one or the other. The

\textsuperscript{3}Note that I have substituted Wells' notation scheme for the one used throughout this essay in order to maintain consistency.
same seems to apply to Tunisian Arabic, Swedish, and, to a lesser extent, Albanian (Cruttenden 2006:17). Consider, for example, the way sports results are read. First, an example of how an English-speaker would read them, de-accenting *one* as expected:

(6) $^{1}\text{Liverpool} \times \text{one} \parallel ^{1}\text{Manchester} \times \text{United} \cdot \text{one}$

An Italian-speaker would not de-accent *uno*, but would intonate both IPs identically. Both these examples are speaker responses from Cruttenden's survey (2006, 15-16), and, as we shall see, Icelandic-speakers will do the exact same thing.

(7) $^{1}\text{Inter} \times \text{uno} \parallel ^{1}\text{Roma} \times \text{uno}$
3. Data from RÚV

For this chapter, I’ve assembled five very short audio clips recorded from the Icelandic state-run radio station Rás 1. The methodology used in collecting them was extremely simple – I listened to internet streams of recent newscasts and whenever I heard a previously used word being repeated at the end of an IP, I went back and recorded the whole relevant utterance. This was the quickest and easiest way to collect a large amount of examples, though the process was entirely dependent on my subjective perception and judgement. Therefore, I will not attempt to make any claims as to the comparative frequency of de- and re-accenting in Icelandic. Nonetheless, these examples should certainly show, if nothing else, if re-accenting occurs, and is a relatively unmarked option in the language, or at least in the formal register that the RÚV newsreaders generally adopt.

What I hope to show in this chapter is fairly limited in scope. My main goal is to show a few instances of re-accenting “in the wild,” as it were. Though the reporters I recorded were all reading from a script, with one exception, this is something that they're quite used to doing. It's reasonable to assume that they're not inventing any new intonational patterns for Icelandic, but simply speaking in the formal register that Icelandic newscasts generally use. Secondly, in addition to looking at accentuation, I would like to show some of the more general, larger scale, intonation patterns that appear constantly in the newsreaders' speech.

For analysis, the Praat speech analyser was used\(^4\). The program is quite handy and versatile in any kind of speech analysis, but its pitch detection algorithm can sometimes be temperamental; especially when dealing with the more complex waveforms, such as voiced consonants or nasalized vowels. The periodicity of these kinds of voiced sounds is harder to detect than for pure vowels, so the algorithm Praat uses sometimes does not detect them.

For each example, a screenshot of its analysis in Praat is shown, along with an annotation. Below that is a transcription of the text with intonation symbols, with items of interest underlined, along with a reference to the full text of the article, in those cases when it is available on the RÚV website. When relevant, the passages surrounding the one under primary discussion are also shown, to give context and for elaboration on other interesting phenomena in the text.

---

3.1. Individual samples and analysis

3.1.1. CLIP ONE

Rás 1, October 14th, 2010

‘Stjórnarmaður í hagsmunasamtökum heimilanna segist hæfilega
Board-member in interests-association-DAT.PL households-DEF. says-REFL. suitably
bjartsýnn á jákvæða níðurstöðu af fundarhöldum vegna skuldavanda
optimistic-M on positive(ACC.) conclusion(ACC.) of meetings(DAT.) because debt-problem(GEN.)
heimilanna||
households(GEN.)

‘A board member in the Homeowner’s Association claims to be fairly optimistic for a positive conclusion to the meetings held because of household debt problems.’

In this first example, the announcer distinctly stresses both occurrences of the word heimilanna. The sentence consists of four IPs, with the first one starting high to signify the change to a new topic (Cruttenden 2006:1) and gradually descending to the newsreader’s normal tone. Both of the next two IPs end in a high rise, signifying that the item’s not finished yet. This is a pattern that will generally hold in the next four examples as well. Here, Icelandic does not distinguish itself from English, where the same phenomena take place.

Repetition of heimilanna (‘the households(GEN.)’) occurs at the end of the sentence and normal, broad focus, nuclear placement is not affected. A person with English intonation patterns would certainly have stressed skuldavanda rather than heimilanna, so this is an unambiguous instance of re-accenting.
3.1.2. Clip Two

(Rás 1, September 20th, 2010.

'(Authorities in Slovakia give children of Roma descent particularly good care and will still ensure they receive a good education. There are many obstacles, though.)

For example, not all parents of these children are interested in them receiving education, and also there had been incidents where parents of children not of Roma origins (had taken their children out of those schools where, among others, Roma children are receiving education.'

The passage in parentheses is not shown on the Praat graphic because the program only allows for 10 seconds of speech to be analysed at once. Nonetheless, since there are

(1yfirvöld í Slóvakíu sinni börnum af rómauppruna sérlega vel
authorities in Slovakia attend children of Roma-origin particularly well

and see ahead about that they receive good education various-

be though in way to example be not all parents these interested-

children interested about that they receive education and then

have bear by that children that are of Roma-descent

have take children their out those schools there that among

others Roma children practice study

'(Authorities in Slovakia give children of Roma descent particularly good care and

will still ensure they receive a good education. There are many obstacles, though.)

For example, not all parents of these children are interested in them receiving

education, and also there had been incidents where parents of children not of Roma

origins (had taken their children out of those schools where, among others, Roma

children are receiving education.'

The passage in parentheses is not shown on the Praat graphic because the program

only allows for 10 seconds of speech to be analysed at once. Nonetheless, since there are
interesting facets to the part not shown there, including multiple instances of reaccenting, I chose to include them in the transcription.

The main item of interest here is the treatment of börn, or children. It appears here four times in various inflections and once as the second part of a compound noun: Rómabörn; Eng. Roma children. Its first appearance is in the middle of the first IP and is therefore unaccented on that occasions. On the two occasions that börn appears in an IP-final setting, the newsreader accents the word both times, with a rise in both instances.

I do not count the Rómabörn for the purposes of seeing whether de-accenting is taking place, since the stress always falls on the first syllable of any word in Icelandic. One might very well consider Rómabörn to be two separate lexical items and, indeed, it is non-standard practice to join together this combination of nationality+member. It so happens that in the script that the newsreader used this was done; and I assume that the newsreader simply treated it as he would any other word: with a stress on the first syllable, regardless of any other considerations.

Another item of interest is menntun, ('education'), and its partial synonym nám (n. 'the act of study'). There appears to be an instance of de-accenting in the clip when the newsreader uses the intonation “fái · menntun” ('receive[PRES.SBJV] education[ACC]') instead of “fái menntun,” which would be more typical if we assume that de-accenting is not a component of Icelandic grammar. This is not necessarily the case, though. The phrase appears earlier in the clip as fái góða menntun ('receive a good education'), and so, this cannot be a case of grammatical de-accenting, since in that case the nucleus would likely have moved all the way back to the adjective áhugasamir. As that is not the case, this is more likely to be an IP with narrow focus on fái.
3.1.3. **Clip Three**

Rás 1, September 19th, 2010

en hagurinn yrði mestur hjá minnstu sveitarfélögunum (Pá segir í skýrslunni but gain-DEF be-SBJV.PST. most-M by smallest-PL.N municipalities-DAT.DEF then says in report-DAT-DEF að grípa þurfi til börstakra ráðstafana til að tryggja að flest sveði that take-INF must-SBJV.3.PL to special-PL.GEN measures-GEN to INFM ensure-INF that most areas innan vesturlands) eigi örugga fulltrúa í sveitarstjórn nýs inside West-land-GEN own-SBJV.PRES.3.PL secure-PL.ACC representatives-ACC in council-DAT new-GEN sveitarfélags municipality-GEN

'But the biggest gains would be made by the smallest municipalities. (The report also says that special measures must be undertaken to ensure that most areas in the west of the country) have secure representatives in the council of a new municipality.'

The silence in the middle of the clip shows where I cut out the intervening few seconds between the two mentions of the word sveitarfélag, ('municipality') so that I could show both instances of the re-accented word in one graph. As in the first clip, the excised portion of the audio is shown in parentheses. The item of interest here is sveitarfélag, which is re-accented as expected.
This is the second year in a row that Iceland lands in first place. Four Nordic countries occupy the top places. Norway, Finland and Sweden are in second, third and fourth place.'

In this example, the announcer quite distinctly re-accents every one of the three instances of sæti ('seat,' meaning place, as in first place), again as expected.
3.1.5. Clip Five

They might arrive very soon and it is assumed that this will progress quite quickly, so two, three hours might pass before everything is clear, but it is assumed that they will arrive quite quickly.

This example differs from the others in that here we don’t have an announcer reading from a script, but a field correspondent answering questions in the field. Nonetheless, the same re-accenting as in the four examples above takes place. The only difference is that here it is the adverbial phrase mjög fljótlega (‘very soon’) which is accented, instead of the noun phrases of the previous examples. Nothing that I know of indicates that these should be treated any differently than NPs and, as the English translation of the clip shows, it would be just as unnatural for an English speaker to accent quite quickly twice as it would be in other instances of given information in an IP-terminal setting.
3.2. Overall analysis of RÚV data

The above chapter presented numerous instances of re-accenting taking place in the speech of Icelandic newsreaders. A good deal of time was spent listening to newscasts in order to pick out the clearest examples of re-accenting and in the course of that, several instances of de-accenting were encountered as well. These were not recorded, mainly to save time and keep the essay to a manageable length. In addition to that, it was simply unnecessary as the point being here is simply that re-accenting occurs.

Neither did I choose to record examples where pronouns or synonyms were substituted, instead of re-using the original word. This was done mainly to make the examples absolutely clear. However, pronouns and synonyms are stylistically the preferred option when referring to previously given information, perhaps partly for the same reasons that de-accenting was generally thought to be a near-universal phenomenon. According to Nolan and Jónsdóttir's results, synonym substitution did not materially affect nuclear placement by English-speakers, except when hypernyms were used. For hypernym substitution, Nolan used sentences like this one: “I gave her an apple, but she doesn't eat fruit.” (189)

Personal pronouns, the use of synonyms, and the de-accenting of old information all share one common usage, among others: They are all ways to avoid word-repetition and, in the case of pronominalization and de-accenting, to minimize the semantic weight of such given information. Thus, perhaps the reason that Icelandic seems not to avoid re-accenting old information is that the language doesn't generally resist such repetition as strongly as, for instance, English. Maybe, Icelandic simply has other ways of accomplishing such a task.

In any case, re-accenting of a repeated word is common enough in Icelandic that I felt quite comfortable in restricting myself exclusively to such examples, and could be reasonable certain to hear an instance or two during any particular newscast I chose to listen to. I was then able to pick the most representative examples and use them here.

As mentioned above, the reason that RÚV news broadcasts were picked as a source of data is that the anchors seem to have quite fixed intonation patterns. The basic pattern can be summed up thus: As the anchors introduce the topic, they start from a relatively high pitch, which descends quickly. Each following IP also tends to end on a rise until the readers finish discussing said topic, and then they wrap things up with a falling nucleus. Falls also occur in the interim, but overall, rises seem to be the rule until the topic
change. Except in cases when narrow focus is used, the nucleus generally falls on the last lexical item, with relatively little regard to whether that information is already given or not. Here is a rough graphical representation of that:

![Diagram of intonation structure]

Newsreaders can, and do, deviate from this extremely simple pattern more often than not, but it still appears to be the template upon which any other intonation they use is based. My conclusion here is that it is the essential pattern used for simple declarative sentences in Icelandic, at least in the formal register employed by the speakers in the audio clips studied. Cruttenden has found the same to be true for English. (1997:103)

Nothing I heard in the course of collecting data for this chapter contradicted the strong re-accenting tendency shown by Nolan and Jónsdóttir in their study. In those cases which resembled de-accenting, there was often some complicating factor at play, such as contrastive stress. On the whole, all of the above examples reinforce their conclusion that de-accenting is certainly not mandatory in Icelandic, nor even particularly common.
4. Survey data

4.1. Notes on Cruttenden's intonation survey

In this section I will discuss the results of a short setting-response survey I laid before 13 native Icelandic speakers of both sexes and in a broad age range. The subjects were instructed to read aloud the B portions of the examples as a response to my reading of the A portions. No further information was provided to them prior them taking the test. Their speech was then recorded and the results processed with Praat in the same way as was done in the previous chapter.

The read text itself is my translation of one that Cruttenden used for a survey in which he investigates de-accenting in several European languages. It is in the form of ten setting-response dialogue types. He had the test translated into various languages and had it administered to native speakers in the following countries:

- **Albanian**, Tirana (4 informants)
- **Arabic**, Tunis (4)
- **French**, principally Provençal (14),
- **German**, Westphalia (2), Munich (1), Tübingen/Hamburg (1)
- **Greek**, Athens (4)
- **Italian**, principally Sicilian (11)
- **Lithuanian**, Vilnius (4)
- **Macedonian**, Skopje (2)
- **Russian**, Moscow (2), Dushambe (2)
- **Spanish**, Chile (2), Castilian (1), Catalonian (1)
- **Swedish**, Skåne (3), Östersund (1)

Using this test, I hope to be able to obtain results that can be put in the context of the other languages that have been tested in this manner. First, there will be an analysis of the results on the basis of individual sentence pairs. Then we will take a look at some of the individual speakers see if any trends can be discerned according to the speakers' age. In Iceland, as in any other westernised country, there is a great deal of English influence on speech. A constant discussion of its effects on the native language has been going on ever since English-speakers first established an Icelandic presence during the Second
World War. It is not unreasonable to assume that intonation patterns may be affected in a similar way as other facets of grammar have been in the Icelandic language.

A note on the subjects: Subjects 4 and 5 are both dyslexic to some degree. Since the test involved them reading aloud passages they had never seen before, I can't reject the possibility that their intonation might be unnatural as a result. There were also numerous other occasions on which subjects inserted, deleted, or shifted words in the text, but making them re-read the sentences in question would only make their prosody more artificial than it already is. Thus it would only compound the already considerable problem of drawing conclusions about the way intonation by having speaker read text aloud. I've kept these examples and transcribed them as they were uttered in the appendix.
4.2. Analysis of individual setting-response pairs

4.2.1. Setting-response 1

A: If you don’t hurry up, you’ll be late.
B: I don’t care if we are late.

A: Ef þú flýtir þér ekki, þá verður þú seinn.
B: Mér er sama þótt ég verði seinn.

The speaker's placement of the nucleus of sentence B is what's being tested here. In most varieties of English, keeping the nucleus on *late* would be unacceptable. The repeated items in this setting-response are *late* and *you/we*, neither of which can take the nucleus. Generally, de-accenting moves the nucleus onto the previous stressable word, which in this example would be *care*: “I don't *care* if we're late.” It is also possible to put the accent onto *are*, in its unreduced form, which yields the sentence “I don't care if we *are* late.” This seems to be dependent upon the speaker's own choice.

Among the Icelandic subjects, none accented *verði*, the expected destination for the nucleus in cases of de-accenting. Two subjects clearly de-accented to *sama*, but most of the subjects had a distinct rise in pitch and volume there, in addition to the expected fall on *seinn*. This is partly expected due to the fact that *sama* contains the first stressed syllable of the IP. What comes before it is part of the pre-head and the first stressed syllable of an IP is often the loudest. When compared to other languages tested using Cruttenden’s test, Icelandic seems closest to Spanish and Swedish.
4.2.2. Setting-response 2

| A: Would you like to come to dinner tonight? I’m afraid it’s only chicken. | B: I don’t like chicken. |
| A: Víltu koma í mat í kvöld? Ég get þó aðeins boðið þér kjúkling. | B: Ég er ekki hrifin(n) af kjúkling. |

Here, a single word is repeated, instead of a whole phrase, as in the last example. According to Cruttenden’s results, this didn’t affect the outcome. In the Icelandic version, though a clear majority of subjects re-accented, a substantial minority did not. Furthermore, those in that minority all de-accented in the same manner as would be expected of English-speakers:

- Re-accenting: “ég er ekki ¹hrifinn af ˣkjúkling”
- De-accenting: “ég er ekki ˣhrifinn af ·kjúkling”

That doesn't mean that Cruttenden is wrong in saying that de-accenting is just as likely to apply to whole phrases as it is to words; it may be more likely that this is simply a statistical anomaly due to the small sample of speakers, or a quirk in the translation. Nonetheless, taking the data at face value, this is the first time that we get results in substantial contrast to Nolan and Jónsdóttir's findings, where all the Icelandic-speakers re-accented consistently. All of those who de-accented were males in their twenties.
4.2.3. **Setting-Response 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A: You need a pair of black shoes for the wedding.</th>
<th>![Chart showing intonation patterns]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B: I’ve already got a pair of black shoes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A: Þú þarft að fá þér svarta skó fyrir brúðkaupið.</th>
<th>![Chart showing intonation patterns]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B: Ég á nú þegar svarta skó.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here again we have a curious discrepancy from Nolan and Jónsdóttir’s findings. The subjects seem almost evenly split, and again the destination of the nucleus matches that found in English, except in the two cases where the subjects accented á. Here are the three different kinds of intonation patterns which emerged.

Ég * á nú · þegar · svarta · skó.

Ég 1 á nú * þegar · svarta · skó.

Ég 1 á nú 1 þegar 1 svarta * skó.

The same people who de-accented in the last example, also did so here, with more joining in, including subject 8, a male in his forties.
4.2.4. Setting-Response 4

A: Why do you keep getting angry?
B: Because John makes me angry.

A: Afhverju ertu alltaf svona reið(ur)?
B: Því Jón gerir mig reiða(n)

Only one subject de-accented here in the English manner, but two put the nucleus on Jón, which I am inclined to attribute to semantic reasons, rather than grammatical; this particular sentence pair takes the form of a question and answer, and the answer to the question is essentially Jón, which might be the reason why those two subjects accented that.

Því Jón gerir mig reiðan

All of those three who didn't re-accent were among the group who also de-accented in the last example.
### 4.2.5. Setting-response 5

| A: He earns at least thirty thousand pounds. | ![Pie chart](chart.png) |
| B: I think he earns forty thousand. |
| A: Hann þénar að minnsta kosti þrjár milljónir króna. | ![Pie chart](chart.png) |
| B: Ég held að hann þéni fjórar milljónir. |

In this example, the results were quite clear, all but one of the subjects had a very clear high fall on *fjórar*. thus appearing to provide the first clear case of a majority of speakers de-accenting.

Curiously, the lone respondent who accented *milljónir* had up to this point generally been in the de-accenting minority. He appears to be a born rebel.
4.2.6. Setting-response 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A: I make the answer sixteen point one.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B: Well, I make it twenty-six point one.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A: Ég fæ út svarið sextán komma einn.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B: Nú, ég fæ út tuttugu og sex komma einn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in the last example, we again have a clear majority of de-accenting here. However, in this scenario there is both potential for grammatical de-accenting and for contrastive stress, which Cruttenden hypothesized would lead to increased occurrence of de-accenting, which it indeed did. He also speculates that numerical contrast may be special and that it might allow de-accenting more easily, which would also help explain these results. Again, a fairly familiar group of de-accenters emerges, with the addition of one female in her twenties, who up to this point had re-accented.
These results are broadly in line with Cruttenden's in that here, unlike the last two cases, we have person contrast as opposed to numbers contrast. In Cruttenden's results, this leads to a marked decrease in re-accenting. The results are similar here, with 10/13 clearly de-accenting. The three subjects who did not are all in the group that has clear re-accenting tendencies.
A: Are you happy with your new house?
B: Yes, I’m happy, and my wife is very happy.

A: Ertu hrifinn af nýja hásinu þínu?
B: Já, ég er ánægður, og konan mín er mjög ánægð.

This example differs from the others above in that the repeated information is not split across the two parts of the sentence pair but is contained entirely within the second sentence. Though the subjects were almost evenly split with regards to accenting in this example, this both agrees and does not agree with Cruttenden's survey. His results were unambiguously in favour of de-accenting, with only French, Arabic, Swedish and Spanish speakers re-accenting at all. Icelandic shares a relevant feature with both French and Arabic, here; that an adjective must agree in gender with its object, cf. French content/contente. Therefore it seems that changes in the gender of a word has some impact on its ability to be re-accented, leading to it being treated as new information in that context. This agrees with the results here in that almost half the subjects re-accented ánægð. This result aligns us with our closest linguistic neighbour in Cruttenden's survey, Sweden, where 2 out of 4 informants re-accented.

As to the six subjects who de-accented, they were evenly split into two camps; those who accented mjög, and those who accented konan. The former follow a tendency of accenting the intensifier that was very widespread in Cruttenden's survey, leading him to conclude that the use of intensifiers regularly leads to de-accenting. The other three, who accented konan, likely did so due to contrastive stress. One of the subjects who did so, subject 2, also misread the text, omitting the intensifier mjög, which leaves konan as the logical place for the accent to end up if one doesn’t re-accent. In addition, this is one of those subjects that regularly de-accented.
4.2.9. *Setting-response 9*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: What was the score?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Liverpool 1 (one), Manchester United 1 (one).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: <em>Hver voru úrslitin?</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Liverpool eitt, United eitt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, the results were unanimous; every one of the subjects re-accented. This is also the case in every other language tested where sports results can be read in this way, except a small minority of Italians and Russians. Cruttenden attributes this to his theory that number contrast has a stronger tendency to produce re-accenting than other kinds of contrast. This result, therefore, entirely supports that conclusion. The fact that sports results are always read this way in the Icelandic media is also quite likely to play a part in this.
Cruttenden's original conception in using these three pairs was that in any language at least one of them would use the same root twice, with an affix added the second time. This is indeed possible for examples (a) and (c) in Icelandic, but the point is moot because of how word stress functions in Icelandic. Under almost all circumstances, it falls on the first syllable of a word, regardless of whether the word has a prefix or not.

None of these three pairs can elicit the responses that Cruttenden was looking for. Subjects did not generally seem to consider atburðir a synonym of fréttir. Cruttenden had the same problem with his English-speakers, some of whom reaccented because they did not sense events as a synonym of news. This is likely to have contributed to the unanimous result in the Icelandic version. Example (b) provoked de-accenting in every subject, even those who had up to this point generally re-accented. I can think of two possible causes of this, other than de-accenting of the English type. Firstly, this might be another instance of contrastive stress, and the steepness of the pitch-contour, in contrast with the rest of the sentence, tends to support that. The other is that there is something special about these adjective+noun NPs, since there was a very similar result in example 5, where all but one respondent de-accented.
4.3. Analysis of individual subjects

*Table 2: Profile of the subjects.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Deacc.</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Deacc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>late twenties</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>early forties</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>mid-twenties</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>mid-twenties</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>early twenties</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>late twenties</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>mid-twenties</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>early forties</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>late twenties</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>mid-sixties</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>late twenties</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>mid-twenties</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>early twenties</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such a small selection of subjects as this does not give one solid ground to make any generalizations about age-related differences, since the overwhelming majority of the respondents are somewhere in their twenties, while two are in their forties and one in her sixties. It is worthwhile, none the less, to try to identify any trends that emerge. Gender-based difference is the most immediately obvious; of the five women who took part, each de-accented 2.6 times on average, while each of the seven participating men did so 4.9 times. All four speakers who de-accented more than four times were also male.
4.4. Overall analysis of survey data

To place the results of the above survey into the appropriate context, I have reproduced a table from Cruttenden's survey. The percentage of subjects that re-accented is shown for all thirteen setting-response pairs. The column in bold is the one containing the results for Icelandic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10a</th>
<th>10b</th>
<th>10c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Icelandic (13)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanian (4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic (4)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French (14)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German (4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek (4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian (11)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian (4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonian (2)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian (4)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish (4)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish (4)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the results for Icelandic are compared as a whole to the other tested languages, it's clear that it places itself among those languages with the greatest tendency towards

---

5Note that Cruttenden's original corresponding table did not use percentages, but simply the number of re-accenting subjects.
re-accenting; e.g. Swedish, Spanish and, to a lesser degree, French. Macedonian also seems to share that tendency but, with only two respondents, it's impossible to tell. It should also be noted that only French has a comparable number of respondents to Icelandic, so the results for Spanish and Swedish should also be taken with a grain of salt.

The results thus fit reasonably well within the spectrum of accentuation that Cruttenden showed in his survey. They seem to agree somewhat less well with Nolan and Jónsdóttir's findings, however. In that paper, the four Icelandic-speakers re-accented in every instance. (2004:191) There may be several factors influencing that result. First, the sample size was smaller than in this survey; and second, they tested a much narrower range of potential de-accenting sentences than Cruttenden's test provides; though Nolan and Jónsdóttir's has more instances of each type. Another may be the relatively relaxed methodology used here in applying Cruttenden's test. His original was similarly informal, as he was just as “concerned to open up a new methodology for cross-linguistic intonational research as I was in the actual results.” (2006:8) Nolan and Jónsdóttir's test goes to greater lengths to get a more natural reading of the sentences, with dummy filler sentences both before and after the actual test sentences. (2004:189)

During the transcription of the survey data, it became clear that the concept of the nucleus is sometimes a problematic one in Icelandic. Many of the speakers exhibited what appear to be multiple or split nuclei in their responses. This poses a problem because of the pivotal role which the nucleus plays in the approach that I follow in this essay. In the first setting-response pair, for example, many of the subjects seem to accent both sama and seinn, as is alluded to in the relevant chapter. Since the subjects still re-accented seinn or de-accented to sama, I chose to ignore this, but it still raises the question of whether it is valid to insist on having a single nucleus per IP – at least in the context of Icelandic.
5. Conclusion

The single most prominent result from the research undertaken for this essay is that Icelandic is certainly not predominantly a de-accenting language. That much is not really in question given general predominance of re-accenting in my results, both from RÚV and from the intonation survey. It is also backed up by Nolan and Jónsdóttir's results.

However, the results from my translation of Cruttenden's test do not entirely match up with Nolan and Jónsdóttir. The fact remains that I found significantly more ambiguity in my results than Nolan did in his; and these results in fact line up with Cruttenden's for other re-accenting languages - particularly Swedish and Spanish. Although re-accenting seems to be the more common pattern in these languages, de-accenting is perfectly within the bounds of normal speaker variation.

It remains to be seen whether the considerable variation between individual speakers in my results means that the status of de-accenting in Icelandic is in flux. My survey had too few respondents, with too little distribution in age range, to tell either way. I can only speculate that it may be more susceptible to change than many other features of the language. Since intonation is left out of orthography, it doesn't enjoy the same protection that, for example, the morphology of Icelandic has enjoyed since it became a written language – unlike its phonology, which has changed far more. Also, speakers are probably far less aware of intonation as a part of language. Therefore, a change in accentuation as subtle, yet as far-reaching, as this could come entirely unheralded, and pass quite unnoticed; even by those who are otherwise most prescriptive regarding language. In any case, that is a question that remains for someone else to tackle.
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7. Appendix

7.1. Individual speaker responses from Cruttenden’s survey

**SETTING-RESPONSE 1**

Subject 1: Mér er 'sama þótt ég 'verði 'sein
Subject 2: Mér er 'sama þótt ég · verði · 'sein
Subject 3: Mér er 'sama þótt ég 'verði 'sein
Subject 4: Mér er 'sama þótt ég 'verði 'sein
Subject 5: Mér er 'sama þó ég 'verði of 'sein
Subject 6: Mér er 'sama þótt ég · verði · 'sein
Subject 7: Mér er 'alveg 'sama þótt ég 'verði 'sein
Subject 8: Mér er 'sama þótt ég 'verði 'sein
Subject 9: Mér er 'sama þótt ég 'verði 'sein
Subject 10: Mér er 'sama þótt ég 'verði 'sein
Subject 11: Mér er 'sama þótt ég 'verði 'sein
Subject 12: Mér er 'sama þótt ég 'verði 'sein
Subject 13: Mér er 'sama þótt ég 'verði 'sein

**SETTING-RESPONSE 2**

Subject 1: Ég er ekki 'hrifinn af · kjúkling.
Subject 2: Ég er ekki 'hrifinn af · kjúkling.
Subject 3: Ég er ekki 'hrifin 1 af 'kjúkling.
Subject 4: Ég er ekki 'hrifinn af 'kjúkling.
Subject 5: Ég er ekki 'hrifinn af 'kjúkling.
Subject 6: Ég er ekki 'hrifinn af · kjúkling.
Subject 7: Ég er ekki 'hrifin af · kjúkling.
Subject 8: Ég er ekki 'hrifinn af · kjúkling.
Subject 9: Ég er ekki 'hrifinn af · kjúkling.
Subject 10: Ég er ekki 'hrifinn af · kjúkling.
Subject 11: Ég er 'ekki 'hrifin af · kjúkling.
Subject 12: Ég er 'ekki 'hrifin af · kjúkling.
Subject 13: Ég er ekki 'hrifin af · kjúkling.

**SETTING-RESPONSE 3**
Subject 1: Ég á nú þegar · svarta · skó.
Subject 2: Ég á nú þegar · svarta · skó.
Subject 3: Ég á nú þegar · svarta · skó.
Subject 4: Ég á nú þegar · svarta · skó.
Subject 5: Ég á nú þegar · svarta · skó.
Subject 6: Ég á nú þegar · svarta · skó.
Subject 7: Ég á nú þegar · svarta · skó.
Subject 8: Ég á nú þegar · svarta · skó.
Subject 9: Ég á nú þegar · svarta · skó.
Subject 10: Ég á nú þegar · svarta · skó.
Subject 11: Ég á nú þegar · svarta · skó.
Subject 12: Ég á nú þegar · svarta · skó.
Subject 13: Ég á nú þegar · svarta · skó.

SETTING-RESPONSE 4
Subject 1: Því Jón gerir mig · reiðan
Subject 2: Því Jón gerir mig · reiðan
Subject 3: Því Jón gerir mig · reiðan
Subject 4: Því Jón gerir mig · reiðan
Subject 5: Því Jón gerir mig · reiðan
Subject 6: Því Jón · gerir mig · reiðan
Subject 7: Því Jón · gerir mig · reiðan
Subject 8: Því Jón · gerir mig · reiðan
Subject 9: Því Jón · gerir mig · reiðan
Subject 10: Því Jón · gerir mig · reiðan
Subject 11: Því Jón · gerir mig · reiða
Subject 12: Því Jón · gerir mig · reiða
Subject 13: Því Jón · gerir mig · reiðan

SETTING-RESPONSE 5
Subject 1: Ég held að hann þéni fjórar · milljónir.
Subject 2: Ég held að hann þéni fjórar · milljónir.
Subject 3: Ég held að hann þéni fjórar · milljónir.
Subject 4: Ég held að hann þéni fjórar · milljónir · króna
Subject 5: Ég held að hann þéni fjórar milljónir.
Subject 6: Ég held að hann þéni fjórar milljónir.
Subject 7: Ég held að hann þéni fjórar milljónir.
Subject 8: Ég held að hann þéni fjórar milljónir.
Subject 9: Ég held að hann þéni fjórar milljónir.
Subject 10: Ég held að hann þéni fjórar milljónir.
Subject 11: Ég held að hann þéni fjórar milljónir.
Subject 12: Ég held að hann þéni fjórar milljónir króna.
Subject 13: Ég held að hann þéni fjórar milljónir.

SETTING-RESPONSE 6
Subject 1: Nú ég fæ út tuttugu og sex komma einn.
Subject 2: Nú ég fæ út tuttugu og sex komma einn.
Subject 3: Nú ég fæ út tuttugu og sex komma einn.
Subject 4: Nú ég fæ út tuttugu og sex komma einn.
Subject 5: Nú ég fæ út tuttugu og sex komma einn.
Subject 6: Nú ég fæ út tuttugu og sex komma einn.
Subject 7: Nú ég fæ út tuttugu og sex komma einn.
Subject 8: Nú ég fæ út tuttugu og sex komma einn.
Subject 9: Nú ég fæ út tuttugu og sex komma einn.
Subject 10: Nú ég fæ út tuttugu og sex komma einn.
Subject 11: Nú ég fæ út tuttugu og sex komma einn.
Subject 12: Nú ég fæ út tuttugu og sex komma einn.
Subject 13: Nú ég fæ út tuttugu og sex komma einn.

SETTING-RESPONSE 7
Subject 1: Þú meinar að syster þín hafi gert öll húsverkin.
Subject 2: Þú meinar að syster þín hafi gert öll húsverkin.
Subject 3: Þú meinar að syster þín hafi gert öll húsverkin.
Subject 4: Þú meinar að syster þín hafi gert öll húsverkin.
Subject 5: Þú meinar að syster þín hafi gert öll húsverkin.
Subject 6: Þú meinar að syster þín hafi gert öll húsverkin.
Subject 7: Þú meinar að syster þín hafi gert öll húsverkin.
Subject 8: Þú meinar að syster þín hafi gert öll húsverkin.
Subject 9: Þú meinar að systir þín hafi gert öll húsverkin.

Subject 10: Þú meinar að systir þín hafi gert öll húsverkin.

Subject 11: Þú meinar að systir þín hafi gert öll húsverkin.

Subject 12: Þú meinar að systir þín hafi gert öll húsverkin.

Subject 13: Þú meinar að systir þín hafi gert öll húsverkin.

SETTING-RESPONSE 8

Subject 1: Já ég er ánægður og konan mín er mjög ánægð

Subject 2: Já ég er ánægður og konan mín er mjög ánægð

Subject 3: Já ég er ánægður og konan mín er mjög ánægð

Subject 4: Já ég er ánægður og konan mín er mjög ánægð

Subject 5: Já ég er ánægður og konan mín er mjög ánægð

Subject 6: Já ég er ánægður og konan mín er mjög ánægð

Subject 7: Já ég er ánægður og konan mín er mjög ánægð

Subject 8: Já ég er ánægður og konan mín er mjög ánægð

Subject 9: Já ég er ánægður og konan mín er mjög ánægð

Subject 10: Já ég er ánægður og konan mín er mjög ánægð

Subject 11: Já ég er ánægður og konan mín er mjög ánægð

Subject 12: Já ég er ánægður og konan mín er mjög ánægð

Subject 13: Já ég er ánægður og konan mín er mjög ánægð

SETTING-RESPONSE 9

Subject 1: Liverpool eitt Únited eitt.

Subject 2: Liverpool eitt Únited eitt.

Subject 3: Liverpool eitt Únited eitt.

Subject 4: Liverpool eitt Únited eitt.

Subject 5: Liverpool eitt Únited eitt.

Subject 6: Liverpool eitt Únited eitt.

Subject 7: Liverpool eitt Únited eitt.

Subject 8: Liverpool eitt Únited eitt.

Subject 9: Liverpool eitt Únited eitt.

Subject 10: Liverpool eitt Únited eitt.

Subject 11: Liverpool eitt Únited eitt.

Subject 12: Liverpool eitt Únited eitt.
Subject 13: Liverpool, United, eitt

SETTING-RESPONSE 10A
Subject 1: Það er nauðsynlegt að halda jafnvægi á milli innlenda og útlenda atburða.
Subject 2: Það er nauðsynlegt að halda jafnvægi á milli innlenda og útlenda atburða.
Subject 3: Það er nauðsynlegt að halda jafnvægi á milli innlenda og útlenda atburða.
Subject 4: Það er nauðsynlegt að halda jafnvægi á milli innlenda og útlenda atburða.
Subject 5: Það er nauðsynlegt að halda jafnvægi á milli innlenda og útlenda atburða.
Subject 6: Það er nauðsynlegt að halda jafnvægi á milli innlenda og útlenda atburða.
Subject 7: Það er nauðsynlegt að halda jafnvægi á milli innlenda og útlenda atburða.
Subject 8: Það er nauðsynlegt að halda jafnvægi á milli innlenda og útlenda atburða.
Subject 9: Það er nauðsynlegt að halda jafnvægi á milli innlenda og útlenda atburða.
Subject 10: Það er nauðsynlegt að halda jafnvægi á milli innlenda og útlenda atburða.
Subject 11: Það er nauðsynlegt að halda jafnvægi á milli innlenda og útlenda atburða.
Subject 12: Það er nauðsynlegt að halda jafnvægi á milli innlenda og útlenda atburða.
Subject 13: Það er nauðsynlegt að halda jafnvægi á milli innlenda og útlenda atburða.

SETTING-RESPONSE 10B
Subject 1: Þú meinar að þetta sé þætt rangt svar.
Subject 2: Þú meinar að þetta sé þætt rangt svar.
Subject 3: Þú meinar að þetta sé þætt rangt svar.
Subject 4: Þú meinar að þetta sé þætt rangt svar.
Subject 5: Þú meinar að þetta sé þætt rangt svar.
Subject 6: Þú meinar að þetta sé þætt rangt svar.
Subject 7: Þú meinar að þetta sé þætt rangt svar.
Subject 8: Þú meinar að þetta sé þætt rangt svar.
Subject 9: Þú meinar að þetta sé þætt rangt svar.
Subject 10: Þú meinar að þetta sé þætt rangt svar.
Subject 11: Þú meinar að þetta sé þætt rangt svar.
Subject 12: Þú meinar að þetta sé þætt rangt svar.
Subject 13: Þú meinar að þetta sé þætt rangt svar.

SETTING-RESPONSE 10C
Subject 1: Mér finnst þeir einmitt vera mjög óvingjarnlegir.
Subject 2: Mér finnst þeir einmitt vera mjög óvingjarnlegir.
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Subject 3: Mér finnst þeir einmitt vera mjög óvingjarnlegir.
Subject 4: Mér finnst þeir einmitt vera mjög óvingjarnlegir.
Subject 5: Mér finnst þeir einmitt vera mjög óvingjarnlegir.
Subject 6: Mér finnst þeir einmitt vera mjög óvingjarnlegir.
Subject 7: Mér finnst þeir einmitt vera mjög óvingjarnlegir.
Subject 8: Mér finnst þeir einmitt vera mjög óvingjarnlegir.
Subject 9: Mér finnst þeir einmitt vera mjög óvingjarnlegir.
Subject 10: Mér finnst þeir einmitt vera mjög óvingjarnlegir.
Subject 11: Mér finnst þeir einmitt vera frekar óvingjarnlegir.
Subject 12: Mér finnst þeir einmitt vera mjög óvingjarnlegir.
Subject 13: Mér finnst þeir einmitt vera mjög óvingjarnlegir.