

Local licensing in Faroese expletive constructions

Eva Engels, University of Aarhus

Abstract

Certain varieties of Faroese display a so far unnoticed co-occurrence restriction in expletive constructions. Although there are two subject positions in the IP domain, SpecAgrSP for the overt expletive and SpecTP for the associate subject, these positions can only be filled simultaneously if expletive and associate subject are separated by the finite verb. This will be accounted for by the assumption that an associate subject needs to be locally licensed by a c-commanding verb, which is not possible if an overt expletive intervenes in the licensing relation. Asymmetries between existential constructions and transitive expletive constructions (TEC) with simple and complex tense and with non-negative and negative associate subject as well as data from former stages of Mainland Scandinavian reveal that local licensing applies to associate subjects in positions in which a TEC subject can be licensed.

1 Introduction

The data I collected during the NORMS Dialect Workshop on the Faroe Islands in August 2008 displayed a co-occurrence restriction in expletive constructions that, to the best of my knowledge, has not been noted before. As illustrated in (1), an expletive may optionally occur in clause-medial position in Faroese. Moreover, an associate subject can occur to the left of a non-finite verb at least in certain varieties of Faroese, referred to as Faroese I in Bobaljik & Jonas (1996) and Jonas (1996a); see (2). This pattern was shown by about two thirds of my informants. However, co-occurrence of an overt expletive and an associate subject in these clause-medial positions is prohibited: The sequence *expletive – associate subject* as in (3) was judged ungrammatical by my informants.¹

¹ Equivalent examples are presented as (marginally) acceptable in Thráinsson et al. (2004: 285/86). However, my informants, who were asked to judge the acceptability of the test sentences on a scale from 5 (good) to 1 (bad), clearly rejected the construction in (3). Median for the construction in (1): 5, in (2)b: 4,5 and in (3): 1.

- (1) a. Í dag hava tað verið **nakrir hundar** úti í garðinum. *Fa*
 b. Í dag hava verið **nakrir hundar** úti í garðinum.
today have(there) been some dogs out in garden-the
- Fa I*
- (2) a. Tað hava verið **nakrir hundar** úti í garðinum.
 b. Tað hava **nakrir hundar** verið úti í garðinum.
there have some dogs been out in garden-the
- (3) *Í dag hava tað **nakrir hundar** verið úti í garðinum. *Fa I*
today have there some dogs been out in garden-the

The paper investigates the ban on clause-medial co-occurrence of overt expletive and associate subject in Faroese I. Section 2 argues in favor of two subject positions in the IP domain, SpecAgrSP for the expletive and SpecTP for the associate subject. However, as discussed in section 3.1, simultaneous filling of these two positions is only possible if the overt expletive and the associate subject are separated by the finite verb. This is accounted for by the assumption that the associate subject requires local licensing by a c-commanding verb. Asymmetries between existential constructions and transitive expletive constructions (TEC) with simple and complex tense (section 3.2) and with non-negative and negative associate subject (section 3.3) indicate that the licensing condition only applies to associate subjects in SpecTP in Faroese: The sequence *expletive – associate subject* is possible as long as the associate subject occurs in a lower position (V° -Comp and SpecNegP, respectively). Mainland Scandinavian data from around 1900 presented in section 4 point to the conclusion that the co-occurrence restriction is not confined to associate subjects in SpecTP after all but more generally applies to associate subjects in positions in which a TEC subject can be licensed. Section 5 summarizes the results.

2 The structure of IP

2.1 Two subject positions in the IP domain

Clause-medial co-occurrence of an overt expletive and an associate subject as in (3) is not only prohibited in Faroese I but is also ungrammatical in the other Scandinavian varieties – Icelandic, (4), Mainland Scandinavian represented by Danish here, (5), and Faroese II, (6).

- (4) *Í dag hafa það **einhverjir hundar** verið í garðinum. *Ic*
today have there some dogs been in garden-the
- (5) *I dag har der **nogle hunde** været i haven. *Da*
today have there some dogs been in garden-the
- (6) *Í dag hava tað **nakrir hundar** verið úti í garðinum. *Fa II*
today have there some dogs been out in garden-the

However, the sentences in (4)-(6) are ruled out for independent reasons. In Icelandic, an overt expletive cannot appear in subject position in main clauses, (7). Occurrence of an associate subject to the left of a non-finite verb is possible, (8).

- (7) a. *Í dag hafa það verið **einhverjir hundar** í garðinum. *Ic*
 b. Í dag hafa verið **einhverjir hundar** í garðinum.
today have (there) been some dogs in garden-the
- (8) a. Það hafa verið **einhverjir hundar** í garðinum. *Ic*
 b. Það hafa **einhverjir hundar** verið í garðinum.
there have some dogs been in garden-the

In Mainland Scandinavian, in contrast, the presence of an overt expletive is obligatory, (9), but an associate subject cannot precede a non-finite verb, (10).²

² Christer Platzack (p.c.) pointed out to me that the associate subject may occur to the left of a non-finite verb in impersonal *bli*-passives in Swedish, giving rise to examples like (i), where the expletive occurs string-adjacent to the associate subject:

- (9) a. I dag har der været **nogle hunde** i haven. Da
 b. *I dag har været **nogle hunde** i haven.
today have(there) been some dogs in garden-the
- (10) a. Der har været **nogle hunde** i haven. Da
 b. *Der har **nogle hunde** været i haven.
there have some dogs been in garden-the

As regards occurrence of an overt expletive in subject position, Faroese seems to be between Icelandic and Mainland Scandinavian as overt expletives are optional in all varieties of Faroese; see (1) above repeated here as (11). However, Faroese II differs from Faroese I in that an associate subject cannot occur to the left of a non-finite verb; compare (2) with (12).

- (11) a. Í dag hava tað verið **nakrir hundar** úti í garðinum. Fa
 b. Í dag hava verið **nakrir hundar** úti í garðinum.
today have (there) been some dogs out in garden-the
- Fa II
- (12) a. Tað hava verið **nakrir hundar** úti í garðinum.
 b. *Tað hava **nakrir hundar** verið úti í garðinum.
there have some dogs been out in garden-the

Thus, Faroese I differs from the other Scandinavian varieties in that both overt expletive and associate subject may occur between a finite verb and a non-finite verb; see (1) and (2) above. But importantly, clause-medial co-occurrence of the two constituents is prohibited, (3).

-
- (i) Blev det några studenter skadade vid olyckan? Sw
was there any students hurt at accident-the (Christer Platzack, p.c.)

The associate subject is not in SpecTP but in a lower position in this case: It follows a non-finite auxiliary; see the discussion in section 3.

- (ii) a. *Hade det några studenter blivit skadade? Sw
 b. Hade det blivit några studenter skadade?
had there been any students hurt (Christer Platzack, p.c.)

Early approaches to Scandinavian expletive constructions suppose that the contrasts between Icelandic and Mainland Scandinavian as to the clause-medial occurrence of overt expletives, (7) vs. (9), and associate subjects, (8) vs. (10), result from the fact that Icelandic has expletive topics whereas Mainland Scandinavian has expletive subjects (see Platzack 1983, 1987, Tomaselli 1990, Sigurðsson 1989, and Maling 1987). As a topic, the expletive is inserted in SpecCP in Icelandic if no other constituent occupies this position; consequently, it cannot occur in SpecIP. SpecIP being empty, the associate subject can move there. This is illustrated in (13).

(13) Ic	SpecCP	C°	SpecIP	V°	Comp	Adv	ex.	
a.	*	XP	aux <u>expl</u>	...	v	sub	adv	(7)a
b.		XP	aux	...	v	sub	adv	(7)b
c.		<u>expl</u>	aux	...	v	sub	adv	(8)a
d.		<u>expl</u>	aux sub	...	v	t _{sub}	adv	(8)b

In Mainland Scandinavian, in contrast, the expletive is a subject and thus must be inserted in SpecIP, from where it can move to SpecCP; see (14). Since SpecIP is occupied by the trace of the expletive, the associate subject cannot move to this position.

(14) MSc	SpecCP	C°	SpecIP	V°	Comp	Adv	ex.	
a.		XP	aux <u>expl</u>	...	v	sub	adv	(9)a
b.	*	XP	aux	...	v	sub	adv	(9)b
c.		<u>expl</u>	aux t _{expl}	...	v	sub	adv	(10)a
d.	*	<u>expl</u>	aux t _{expl} sub	...	v	t _{sub}	adv	(10)b

Under the above assumptions, Faroese I would have to have both expletive topics and expletive subjects: An overt expletive may be inserted in SpecIP as it can optionally occur in this position, (1), or it may be inserted in SpecCP, permitting movement of the associate subject to SpecIP, (2); see also (15) below. Moreover, the prohibition against the clause-medial sequence *expletive - associate subject* shown in (3) above would follow from the fact that the two constituents compete for the same position, (15)e.

(15) Fa I	SpecCP	C°	SpecIP	V°	Comp	Adv	ex.	
a.	XP	aux	<u>expl</u>	...	v	sub	adv	(1)a
b.	XP	aux		...	v	sub	adv	(1)b
c.	<u>expl</u>	aux		...	v	sub	adv	(2)a
d.	<u>expl</u>	aux	sub	...	v	t _{sub}	adv	(2)b
e.	*	XP	aux <u>expl</u> sub	...	v	t _{sub}	adv	(3)

However, the pattern observed in Faroese II is problematic for the above analysis. Overt expletives in SpecIP are optional in all varieties of Faroese, but associate subjects cannot occur to the left of a non-finite verb in Faroese II; see (11) and (12) above. Thus, although an overt expletive apparently need not be inserted in SpecIP, the associate subject cannot occupy this position. This is unexpected under the assumption that the possibility of not having an overt expletive in subject position paves the way for the associate subject to occur to the left of a non-finite verb. Instead, the data strongly suggest that these two phenomena are not directly related.

In addition, the fact that an overt expletive may optionally occur in SpecIP in Icelandic embedded questions such as (16) contradicts the hypothesis that *það* 'there' is a syntactic topic that can only be inserted in SpecCP.³ (On further arguments against the topic approach to Icelandic expletives see Hornstein 1991.)

- (16) a. ... hvort það hefur **einhver útlendingur** verið ... *Ic*
 b. ... hvort hefur **einhver útlendingur** verið ...
 ... í sumarhúsinu.
whether (there) has some foreigner been
in summerhouse-the
 (Thráinsson 2007: 26)

³ The tendency that overt expletives are more likely to emerge in embedded clauses than in main clauses can also be observed in Faroese. While overt expletives are optional in main clauses, (1), they are obligatory in embedded clauses, (i).

- (i) a. Hon spurdi um tað budði **ein gamal maður** i hesum húsinum. *Fa*
 b. *Hon spurdi um budði **ein gamal maður** i hesum húsinum.
she asked if (there) lived an old man in this house-the
 (Thráinsson et al. 2004: 283)

by Object Shift in a transitive expletive construction like (20); see Holmberg (1986, 1999) and Engels & Vikner (2007) on Object Shift.

- (19) a. Það mun hafa verið **gód mynd** ... *Ic*
 b. *Það mun hafa **gód mynd** verið ...
 c. Það mun **gód mynd** hafa verið ...
 ... í sjónvarpinu.
there must good film have been on TV
 (adapted from Vikner 1995: 212)

- (20) a. Það borðuðu **margir strákar** *bjúgun* ekki. *Ic*
there ate many boys sausages-the not
 (Bobaljik & Jonas 1996: 214)
 b. ?Það drekka sennilega **sumir krakkar** *hana* aldrei.
there drink probably some kids it never
 (Vangsnes 2002: 45)

As supported by the phenomena described above, newer approaches to expletive constructions (e.g. Bobaljik & Jonas 1996, Jonas 1996a,b, Bobaljik & Thráinsson 1998, and Vangsnes 2002) suppose that there are two subject positions in the IP domain, which will be taken here to be SpecAgrSP for the expletive and SpecTP for the associate subject.

2.2 Cross-linguistic variation as to the structure of IP

The previous section argued for two subject positions in the IP domain, SpecAgrSP and SpecTP. However, the availability of SpecTP would seem to be subject to cross-linguistic variation. While an associate subject may occur to the left of a non-finite verb in Icelandic and Faroese I, this is ungrammatical in Mainland Scandinavian and Faroese II; compare (2) and (8) with (10) and (12) above, repeated in (21)-(24).

- (21) a. Það hafa verið **einhverjir hundar** í garðinum. *Ic*
 b. Það hafa **einhverjir hundar** verið í garðinum.
there have some dogs been in garden-the
- (22) a. Tað hava verið **nakrir hundar** úti í garðinum. *Fa I*
 b. Tað hava **nakrir hundar** verið úti í garðinum.
there have some dogs been out in garden-the
- (23) a. Tað hava verið **nakrir hundar** úti í garðinum. *Fa II*
 b. *Tað hava **nakrir hundar** verið úti í garðinum.
there have some dogs been out in garden-the
- (24) a. Der har været **nogle hunde** i haven. *Da*
 b. *Der har **nogle hunde** været i haven.
there have some dogs been in garden-the

This variation correlates with contrasts as to the acceptability of transitive expletive constructions (TECs): TECs are only possible in languages where SpecTP is available. They are acceptable in Icelandic, (25), and Faroese I, (26), but ungrammatical in Faroese II, (27), and Mainland Scandinavian, (28).⁴

⁴ However, as Karen Margrethe Pedersen (p.c.) pointed out to me, TECs seem to be possible in some Danish dialects, (i); see also Pedersen & Sørensen (*to appear*). Correspondingly, the associate subject in an intransitive expletive construction can occur to the left of the non-finite verb, (ii).

- (i) a. Der skal **nogen** passe dem. *Falster*
there should somebody care-for them
 b. Har der **nogen** sagt dig det? *Eastern Jutland*
has there somebody told you this
 c. Så havde der **en hund** bidt dem i buksebenene. *Sjælland*
so had there a dog bit them in trousers-the
 (Pedersen & Sørensen, *forthcoming*)
- (ii) a. Så kunne der godt **en damper** løbe over dem. *Sjælland*
so could there well a steamer run over them
 b. Nu vil der snart **én** drukne. *Eastern Jutland*
now will there soon one drown
 c. Har der **nogen** været inde ved dig? *Western Jutland*
has there somebody been in by you (Pedersen & Sørensen, *forthcoming*)

- (25) Það byggðu **margir Íslendingar** hús í Þórshöfn. *Ic*
there built many Icelanders house in Tórshavn
 (Jonas 1996b: 168)
- (26) Tað bygdu **nakrir Íslendingar** hús í Havn. *Fa I*
there built some Icelanders house in Tórshavn
 (Jonas 1994: 50)
- (27) *Tað bygdu **nakrir Íslendingar** hús í Havn. *Fa II*
there built some Icelanders house in Tórshavn
 (Jonas 1994: 50)
- (28) *Der byggede **nogle islændinge** hus í Tórshavn. *Da*
there built some Icelanders house in Torshavn

The above contrast is accounted for by the assumption that the associate subject of a TEC cannot remain in its VP-internal base position, SpecvP.⁵ In Icelandic and Faroese I, the associate subject can be licensed in SpecTP. In contrast, in Faroese II and Mainland Scandinavian, where SpecTP is not available, the associate subject cannot be licensed and consequently TECs are ungrammatical. (Unavailable positions are marked by shading in (29).)

Notice that the co-occurrence restriction observed in Faroese I does not seem to hold in these dialects: Both overt expletive and associate subject appear in clause-medial positions in (i)b,c and (ii).

⁵ Note that the associate subject of a TEC must precede all non-finite verbs.

- (i) a. *... að það mundi hafa borðað **einhver** þetta epli. *Ic*
 b. *... að það mundi hafa **einhver** borðað þetta epli.
 c. ... að það mundi **einhver** hafa borðað þetta epli.
that there would somebody have eaten this apple
 (Vikner 1995: 191)

(29) TEC		CP – AgrSP	SpecTP	SpecvP	V°	Comp	ex.
Ic/	a.	* <u>expl</u> v		sub	t _v	obj	-
Fa I	b.	<u>expl</u> v	sub	t _{sub}	t _v	obj	(25)/(26)
MSc/	c.	* <u>expl</u> v		sub	t _v	obj	(27)/(28)
Fa II	d.	* <u>expl</u> v	sub	t _{sub}	t _v	obj	(27)/(28)

**no SpecTP
in MSc/Fa II**

**licensing of TEC
associate subject
in SpecTP**

**no licensing of
TEC associate
subject in SpecvP**

In contrast to TECs, the associate subject of an existential construction can be licensed in its base position (as complement of V°; see Vikner 1995). In addition, it may move to and be licensed in SpecTP if this position is available in the given language. This is illustrated in (30).

(30) existential		CP – AgrSP	SpecTP	V°	Comp	Adv	ex.
Ic/	a.	<u>expl</u> aux		v	sub	adv	(2)a/(8)a
Fa I	b.	<u>expl</u> aux	sub	v	t _{sub}	adv	(2)b/(8)b
MSc/	c.	<u>expl</u> aux		v	sub	adv	(10)a/(12)a
Fa II	d.	* <u>expl</u> aux	sub	v	t _{sub}	adv	(10)b/(12)b

**no SpecTP
in MSc/Fa II**

**licensing of
existential associate
subject in SpecTP**

**licensing of
existential subject
in V°-Comp**

The variation across the Scandinavian languages as to the availability of SpecTP has been considered to be due to a structural contrast between the languages (i.e. the position is not projected at all in some varieties, e.g. Bobaljik & Thráinsson 1998 and Koeneman & Neeleman 2001) or to differences in checking requirements (i.e. though present, the position cannot be occupied by an associate subject, e.g. Bobaljik & Jonas 1996 and Vangsnes 2002). For reasons of exposition, I will follow the former analysis here but nothing hinges on this assumption.

In addition, the approaches to expletive constructions differ in the theoretical implementation of why the availability of SpecTP varies across the Scandinavian languages (see Richards 2006). Basically, two main camps can be distinguished: (a) those approaches which attribute the (non)availability of SpecTP to the presence/absence of full DP Object Shift (Bures' generalisation; e.g. Bures 1992, 1993, Bobaljik & Jonas 1996, Koster & Zwart 2001, and Richards 2006), and (b) those approaches which attribute it to verb movement (Vikner's generalisation; e.g. Vikner 1990, 1995, Sigurðsson 1991, Bobaljik & Thráinsson 1998, and Koenenman & Neeleman 2001).

In this connection, notice that full DP Object Shift is not possible in Faroese, (31), although SpecTP is available at least in Faroese I; see (2)/(26). This points to the conclusion that the availability of SpecTP does not depend on the acceptability of full DP Object Shift.

- (31) a. Eg las **ikki** bókina. *Fa*
 b. *Eg las bókina **ikki**.
I read book-the not (Thráinsson et al. 2004: 245)

According to Vikner's generalisation, the availability of a clause-medial position for the associate subject presupposes V2 and V^o-to-I^o movement. While all of the Scandinavian languages are V2, they vary as to V^o-to-I^o movement. V^o-to-I^o movement takes place in embedded clauses in Icelandic but not in Mainland Scandinavian (at least not to the same extent; see Bentzen 2007 and Wiklund et al. 2007). Moreover, Bobaljik & Jonas (1996) and Jonas (1996a,b) claim that embedded V^o-to-I^o movement is optional in Faroese I but ungrammatical in Faroese II. Comparison with data on verb movement collected by Kristine Bentzen, Piotr Garbacz, Caroline Heycock, and Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson during the NORMS Dialect Workshop on the Faroe Islands showed that V^o-to-I^o movement in embedded clauses was rejected by my Faroese II informants whereas it was judged slightly better, though still strongly marked, by my Faroese I informants. (See also Bentzen et al. 2009 on Faroese verb movement).

- (32) a. *Það kom á óvart að María **ekki** les bækur. *Ic*
 b. Það kom á óvart að María les **ekki** bækur.
it was unexpected that Maria read not books

(Jonas 1996b: 173)

- (33) a. Eg spurdi hví Jógvan **ikki** hevði lisið bókina. *Fa I*
 b. Eg spurdi hví Jógvan hevði **ikki** lisið bókina.
I asked why Jogvan had not read book-the

(Jonas 1996a: 95)

- (34) a. Eg spurdi hví Jógvan **ikki** hevði lisið bókina. *Fa II*
 b. *Eg spurdi hví Jógvan hevði **ikki** lisið bókina.
I asked why Jogvan had not read book-the

(Jonas 1996a: 95)

- (35) a. Det er uventet at Marie **ikke** læser bøger. *Da*
 b. *Det er uventet at Marie læser **ikke** bøger.
it is unexpected that Marie reads not books

Vikner (1995: 186/87) claims that I° is only able to (Case-)license the associate subject position to the left of the non-finite verb, which he takes to be SpecVP, if I° is filled and does not already assign another case. Only in V° -to- I° languages such as Icelandic and Faroese I is I° "filled" (strong) and may thus assign Case to SpecVP. In the languages without V° -to- I° movement such as Mainland Scandinavian and Faroese II, SpecVP is not licensed since I° is not filled. A subject thus cannot surface in this position.^{6,7}

As discussed in the following section, licensing of an associate subject in clause-medial position (here taken to be SpecTP) seems to be subject to an even

⁶ Movement through I° on the way to C° does not suffice to permit Case assignment to SpecVP in Mainland Scandinavian and Faroese II.

⁷ SpecVP is not licensed in non-V2 languages like English and French either, where I° already assigns nominative to SpecIP under Spec-head agreement. This rules out TECs and existential associate subjects in clause-medial position altogether. In V2 languages, in contrast, C° is taken to assign nominative case to the constituent in SpecIP even if no V° -to- I° -to- C° movement takes place as e.g. in embedded clauses. The availability of the clause-medial position and TECs are thus not expected to be root-clause phenomena only.

stronger restriction: It requires a local relationship between the associate subject and the finite verb.

3 Local licensing of associate subjects in SpecTP

3.1 Position of the finite verb

It was shown above that although both an overt expletive and an associate subject may occur between a finite verb and a non-finite verb in Faroese I, (1) and (2), the clause-medial sequence *expletive – associate subject* is ungrammatical in existential constructions; see (3) repeated here as (36)a. The same holds for TECs; compare (26) with (36)b.

- (36) a. *Í dag hava tað **nakrir hundar** verið úti í garðinum. *Fa I*
today have there some dogs been out in garden-the
- b. *Allarhelst hefur tað **onkur** keypt husið hjá Róa.
probably has there somebody bought house-the of Roa

Given that there are two subject positions in the IP domain in Faroese I (SpecAgrSP for the expletive and SpecTP for the associate subject), as argued for in the previous section, this restriction cannot be due to the fact that the two constituents compete for the same position. In fact, co-occurrence of an overt expletive and an associate subject in the IP domain is marginally acceptable in embedded questions; see (18) repeated here as (37). (Remember that the expletive must be located in SpecAgrSP in (37) as embedded questions do not permit CP recursion; see (17) above.)

- Fa I*
- (37) a. ?Hon spurdi um tað høvdu **nakrir hundar** verið úti í garðinum.
she asked if there had some dogs been out in garden-the

- b. ??Hon spurdi um tað hevði **onkur** keypt húsini hjá Róa.
she asked if there had somebody bought houses-the of Roa
 (Zakaris Svabo Hansen, p.c.)

Recall that V° -to- I° movement is optional in embedded clauses in Faroese I, (33). Interestingly, simultaneous filling of SpecAgrSP and SpecTP is ungrammatical if V° -to- I° movement does not take place, as shown by the example in (38).

Fa I

- (38) a. *Hon spurdi um tað **nakrir hundar** høvdu verið úti í garðinum.
she asked if there some dogs had been out in garden-the
- b. *Hon spurdi um tað **onkur** hevði keypt húsið hjá Róa.
she asked if there somebody had bought house-the of Roa
 (Zakaris Svabo Hansen, p.c.)

What distinguishes the grammatical sentences in (37) from the ungrammatical ones in (36) and (38) is that the finite verb intervenes between the expletive in SpecAgrSP and the associate subject in SpecTP in the former but precedes and follows both constituents in the latter examples, respectively. Thus, co-occurrence of an overt expletive and an associate subject in the IP domain is apparently only possible if the finite verb intervenes between the two constituents.

That it is not pure string-adjacency between an overt expletive and an associate subject that is prohibited is shown by the examples in (39).⁸ An intervening adverb does not yield acceptability.

- (39) a. *Í dag hava tað *kanska* **nakrir hundar** verið úti í garðinum. *Fa I*
today have there maybe some dogs been out in garden-the

⁸ This hypothesis is also corroborated by the fact that the sequence *expletive – associate subject* is acceptable as long as the associate subject does not occur in SpecTP; see sections 3.2 and 3.3 below.

- b. *Í dag hefur tað *kanska* **onkur** keypt húsið hjá Róa.
today has there maybe somebody bought house-the of Roa

Apparently, an overt expletive must be separated from the associate subject by an intervening verb. Similar to the embedded clauses in (37), this is the case in the main clauses in (40), where the overt expletive occupies SpecCP and the finite verb occurs in C°.

- (40) a. Tað hava **nakrir hundar** verið úti í garðinum. *Fa I*
there have some dogs been out in garden-the
- b. Tað keypti **onkur** husið hjá Róa.
there bought somebody house-the of Roa

The above data suggest that an associate subject in SpecTP needs to be locally licensed by the finite verb. Assume that the associate subject carries a D-feature, which must be probed by a c-commanding verb. Thereby, the exact structural position of the verb is not relevant: It may appear in AgrS° or C°; see (37) and (40) above. However, it is important that the licensing relation is local: Licensing of the associate subject in SpecTP is not possible if an overt expletive intervenes between the verb and the associate subject; see (36).⁹ In this case the verb cannot probe the associate subject's D-feature because there is a closer one, namely the one of the expletive. The hypothesis that the intervening expletive's D-feature blocks licensing of the associate subject in SpecTP is supported by the fact that an intervening adverb, which does not carry the relevant feature, does not yield ungrammaticality; see (41).

⁹ Note that only overt constituents count for licensing. First, checking has to be carried out by the verb in its surface position. If it could be done by the verb trace in AgrS°, the ungrammaticality of (36) would be unexpected. Second, given that the overt expletive is always merged in SpecAgrSP, from where it may move to SpecCP, the sentences in (40) indicate that only the overt expletive but not its trace in SpecAgrSP blocks local licensing.

- (41) a. Tað hava *kanska* **nakrir hundar** verið úti í garðinum. *Fa I*
there have maybe some dogs been out in garden-the
- b. Tað hefur *kanska* **onkur** keypt húsið hjá Róa.
there has maybe somebody bought house-the of Roa

To sum up, clause-medial co-occurrence of overt expletive and associate subject would seem to depend on local licensing, as illustrated in (42).

(42) Fa I	Spec CP	C°	Spec AgrSP	AgrS°	Spec TP	...	Aux°	...	V°	...	ex.	
local	a.	<u>expl</u>	aux	t _{expl}	t _{aux}	sub	...	t _{aux}	...	v	...	(1)
licensing	b.		Comp	expl	aux	sub	...	t _{aux}	...	v	...	(37)
no local	c.	* XP	aux	<u>expl</u>	t _{aux}	sub	...	t _{aux}	...	v	...	(36)
licensing	d.	*	Comp	expl		sub	...	aux	...	v	...	(38)

Asymmetries between existential constructions and TECs with simple and complex tense and with non-negative and negative associate subjects discussed in the following sections show that the above licensing requirement only applies to associate subjects in SpecTP. The sequence *expletive – associate subject* is acceptable as long as the associate subject occurs in a lower position.

3.2 Simple versus complex tense

Intervention of an overt expletive between the finite verb and the associate subject is not prohibited as such. The sequence *expletive – associate subject* is acceptable in existential constructions with simple tense, (43), but not in ones with complex tense, (44). These facts indicate that an associate subject in the IP domain but not one in VP-internal position is subject to the licensing condition discussed in the previous section.

- (43) a. Tað vóru **nakrir hundar** úti í garðinum. *Fa I*
 b. Í morgun vóru tað **nakrir hundar** úti í garðinum.
in morning-the were there some dogs out in garden-the
- (44) a. Tað hava **nakrir hundar** verið úti í garðinum. *Fa I*
 b. *Í morgun hava tað **nakrir hundar** verið úti í garðinum.
in morning-the have there some dogs been out in garden-the

In the simple tense case in (43), the exact structural position of the associate subject is obscured by V° -to- I° -to- C° movement. The associate subject could be located in the complement position of V° or in the specifier position of TP. In contrast, the only position to the left of a non-finite verb available to the associate subject in (44) is SpecTP. As discussed in the previous section, an associate subject in this position needs to check its D-feature with the c-commanding verb, which is not possible if an overt expletive intervenes in the checking relation since there would then be a D-feature closer to the verb. Under the assumption that an associate subject in V° -Comp does not require local licensing, the contrast between (43) and (44) follows: In (43)b but not in (44)b the sequence *expletive – associate subject* may have a structure, in which the associate subject is licensed, as illustrated in (45).¹⁰

¹⁰ As there are semantic restrictions on associate subjects in clause-medial and post-lexical position (see Vangsnes 2002), the acceptability of (43)b is expected to be dependent on the type of DP.

(45) Fa I: existential		CP- AgrSP	SpecTP	V°	Comp	Adv	ex.
no intervening expletive	simple	a. <u>expl</u> v		t _v	sub	adv	(43)a
	tense	b. <u>expl</u> v	sub	t _v	t _{sub}	adv	(43)a
	complex	c. <u>expl</u> aux		v	sub	adv	(2)a
	tense	d. <u>expl</u> aux	sub	v	t _{sub}	adv	(44)a
intervening expletive	simple	e. v <u>expl</u>		t _v	sub	adv	(43)b
	tense	f. * v <u>expl</u>	sub	t _v	t _{sub}	adv	-
	complex	g. aux <u>expl</u>		v	sub	adv	(1)a
	tense	h. * aux <u>expl</u>	sub	v	t _{sub}	adv	(44)b

**intervening expletive blocks
licensing of associate subject
in SpecTP**

In contrast to existential constructions, TECs do not permit the sequence *expletive – associate subject* at all, irrespective of simple or complex tense.

- (46) a. Tað keypti **onkur** husið hjá Róa. *Fa I*
 b. *Allarhelst keypti tað **onkur** husið hjá Róa.
probably bought there somebody house-the of Roa

- (47) a. Tað hefur **onkur** keypt husið hjá Róa. *Fa I*
 b. *Allarhelst hefur tað **onkur** keypt husið hjá Róa.
probably has there somebody bought house-the of Roa

Given that the associate subject of a TEC cannot remain in its base position SpecvP but must move to SpecTP (see section 2), the above pattern is expected. Independent of simple and complex tense, the associate subject cannot be licensed if it is separated from the licensing verb by an intervening overt expletive.

(48) Fa I: TEC		CP – AgrSP	SpecTP	SpecvP	V°	Comp	ex.
no intervening expletive	simple	a. * <u>expl</u> v		sub	t _v	obj	-
	tense	b. <u>expl</u> v	sub	t _{sub}	t _v	obj	(46)a
	complex	c. * <u>expl</u> aux		sub	v	obj	-
	tense	d. <u>expl</u> aux	sub	t _{sub}	v	obj	(47)a
intervening expletive	simple	e. * v <u>expl</u>		sub	t _v	obj	(46)b
	tense	f. * v <u>expl</u>	sub	t _{sub}	t _v	obj	(46)b
	complex	g. * aux <u>expl</u>		sub	v	obj	(47)b
	tense	h. * aux <u>expl</u>	sub	t _{sub}	v	obj	(47)b

intervening expletive blocks licensing of associate subject in SpecTP	licensing of TEC associate subject in SpecTP	no licensing of TEC associate subject in SpecvP
--	---	--

3.3 Non-negative versus negative associate subject

Asymmetries between expletive constructions with non-negative associate subject and ones with negative associate subject point to the conclusion that it is not an associate subject in the IP domain but more specifically an associate subject in SpecTP that requires local licensing. While the clause-medial sequence *expletive – associate subject* is ruled out for existential constructions with a non-negative associate subject, it is possible in existential constructions with a negative subject; see the contrast between (49) and (50).

- (49) a. Tað hava **nakrir hundar** verið úti í garðinum. *Fa I*
 b. *Í morgun hava tað **nakrir hundar** verið úti í garðinum.
in morning-the have there some dogs been out in garden-the

- (50) a. Tað hava **eingir hundar** verið úti í garðinum. *Fa I*
 b. Í morgun hava tað **eingir hundar** verið úti í garðinum.
in morning-the have there no dogs been out in garden-the

There is reason to believe that a negative associate subject to the left of a non-finite verb need not occupy SpecTP as there is a special position for negative phrases in the IP domain. Under a sentential negation reading, a negative object cannot remain *in situ* in the Scandinavian languages but must undergo Negative Shift: The negative phrase moves to SpecNegP, where it checks its [+negative] feature (see K. K. Christensen 1986, 1987, Rögnvaldsson 1987, Jónsson 1996, Svenonius 2000, 2002, K. R. Christensen 2005, and Engels 2009, *to appear* on Negative Shift).

- (51) a. *Ég hef [VP sagt **ekkert**] *Ic*
 a'. Ég hef [NegP **ekkert**] [VP sagt t_O]
- b. *Eg havi [VP sagt **einki**] *Fa*
 b'. Eg havi [NegP **einki**] [VP sagt t_O]
- c. *Jeg har [VP sagt **ingenting**] *Da*
 c'. Jeg har [NegP **ingenting**] [VP sagt t_O]
I have nothing said

Like negative objects, negative associate subjects cannot remain in VP-internal position but must undergo Negative Shift. As a result, non-negative associate subjects in Danish and Faroese II differ from negative ones in that the former cannot precede a non-finite verb whereas the latter must do so; compare (52) and (54) repeated from (10) and (12) with (53) and (55).¹¹

¹¹ While string-vacuous Negative Shift is possible in all Scandinavian languages, there is a considerable amount of cross-linguistic variation as to non-string-vacuous Negative Shift; see Engels (2009, *to appear*). For instance in Norwegian, Negative Shift cannot cross a verb *in situ*, (i). As a consequence, negative associate subjects are ruled out in existential constructions with complex tense, (ii), while they may appear in constructions with simple tense, where Negative Shift can apply string-vacuously, (iii).

- (i) a. Jeg sa **ingenting** t_v t_O. *No*
I said nothing
- b. *Jeg har **ingenting** sagt t_O.
I have nothing said

- (52) a. Der har været **nogle hunde** i haven. *Da*
 b. *Der har **nogle hunde** været i haven.
there have some dogs been in garden-the

- (53) a. *Der har været **ingen hunde** i haven. *Da*
 b. Der har **ingen hunde** været i haven.
there have no dogs been in garden-the

Fa II

- (54) a. Tað hava verið **nakrir hundar** úti í garðinum.
 b. *Tað hava **nakrir hundar** verið úti í garðinum.
there have some dogs been out in garden-the

- (55) a. *Tað hava verið **eingir hundar** úti í garðinum. *Fa*
 b. Tað hava **eingir hundar** verið úti í garðinum.
there have no dogs been out in garden-the

The above contrast between negative and non-negative associate subjects as to the ability to occur to the left of a non-finite verb is accounted for by the assumption that SpecNegP may only host a negative phrase: Negative Shift takes place for checking of [+negative] and consequently may only affect constituents with a corresponding feature. A non-negative associate subject to the left of a non-finite verb, in contrast, would have to occur in SpecTP, which is not available in Mainland Scandinavian and Faroese II (see section 2). This is illustrated in (56).¹²

-
- (ii) a. *Det har vært **ingen hunder** i hagen. *No*
 b. *Det har **ingen hunder** vært t₀ i hagen.
there have no dogs been in garden-the
- (iii) Det var **ingen hunder** t_v t₀ i hagen. *No*
there were no dogs in garden-the

¹² Note that TP dominates NegP: An associate subject precedes an Object Shifted object, (20), and an Object Shifted object precedes a Negative Shifted one, (i).

- (i) Hun låner ham sikkert **ingenting**. *Da*
she lends him surely nothing

(56) Da/Fa II: existential		CP - AgrSP	SpecTP	SpecNegP	V ^o	Comp	Adv	ex.
	a.	<u>expl</u> aux			v	sub _[-n]	adv	(52)a/(54)a
[-neg]	b.	* <u>expl</u> aux		sub _[-n]	v	t _{sub}	adv	(52)b/(54)b
	c.	* <u>expl</u> aux	sub _[-n]		v	t _{sub}	adv	(52)b//(54)b
	d.	* <u>expl</u> aux			v	sub _[+n]	adv	(53)a/(55)a
[+neg]	e.	<u>expl</u> aux		sub _[+n]	v	t _{sub}	adv	(53)b/(55)b
	f.	* <u>expl</u> aux	sub _[+n]	t _{sub}	v	t _{sub}	adv	-

**no SpecTP
in MSc/Fa II**

**no [-neg]
in SpecNegP**

**no [+neg]
in VP**

As illustrated in (49)a and (50)a above, both non-negative and negative associate subjects may precede a non-finite verb in Faroese I, where both SpecTP and SpecNegP are in principle available to the associate subject of an existential construction. However, in contrast to a non-negative associate subject in SpecTP, a negative one in SpecNegP would seem not to require local licensing: An overt expletive may intervene between the finite verb and a negative associate subject; see the contrast between (49)b and (50)b. Hence, local licensing would seem to be restrained to associate subjects in SpecTP in Faroese I.¹³

¹³ The negative associate subject in SpecNegP is licensed by virtue of being [+negative].

(57) Fa I: existential		CP – AgrSP	SpecTP	SpecNegP	V°	Comp	Adv	ex.
no intervening expletive	a.	<u>expl</u> aux			v	sub _[-n]	adv	(2)a
	[-neg]	b. * <u>expl</u> aux		sub _[-n]	v	t _{sub}	adv	-
		c. <u>expl</u> aux	sub _[-n]		v	t _{sub}	adv	(49)a
		d. * <u>expl</u> aux			v	sub _[+n]	adv	(55)a
	[+neg]	e. <u>expl</u> aux		sub _[+n]	v	t _{sub}	adv	(50)a
		f. <u>expl</u> aux	sub _[+n]	t _{sub}	v	t _{sub}	adv	(50)a
intervening expletive		g. aux <u>expl</u>			v	sub _[-n]	adv	(1)a
	[-neg]	h. * aux <u>expl</u>		sub _[-n]	v	t _{sub}	adv	(49)b
		i. * aux <u>expl</u>	sub _[-n]		v	t _{sub}	adv	(49)b
		j. * aux <u>expl</u>			v	sub _[+n]	adv	-
	[+neg]	k. aux <u>expl</u>		sub _[+n]	v	t _{sub}	adv	(50)b
		l. * aux <u>expl</u>	sub _[+n]	t _{sub}	v	t _{sub}	adv	-

intervening expletive blocks
licensing of associate subject
in SpecTP

no [-neg]
in SpecNegP

no [+neg]
in VP

In contrast to existential constructions, a negative associate subject does not cancel out the co-occurrence restriction on clause-medial overt expletives and associate subjects in TECs. Just as with non-negative associate subjects, an overt expletive must not intervene between a negative associate subject and the finite verb; see (58) and (59).

- (58) a. Tað hevur **onkur** keypt husið hjá Róa. *Fa I*
 b. *Allarhelst hevur tað **onkur** keypt husið hjá Róa.
probably has there somebody bought house-the of Roa

- (59) a. Tað hevur **eingin** keypt husið hjá Róa. *Fa I*
 b. *Allarhelst hevur tað **eingin** keypt husið hjá Róa.
probably has there nobody bought house-the of Roa

This follows under the assumption that the associate subject of a TEC does not only have to leave its base position Spec ν P but must be licensed in SpecTP. Like a non-negative associate subject, a negative associate subject of a TEC thus has to move to SpecTP, where it would have to be locally licensed.

(60) Fa I: TEC		CP - AgrSP	Spec TP	Spec NegP	Spec ν P	V ^o	Comp	ex.
no intervening expletive	a.	* <u>expl</u> aux			sub _[-n]	v	obj	-
	[-neg] b.	* <u>expl</u> aux		sub _[-n]	t _{sub}	v	obj	-
	c.	<u>expl</u> aux	sub _[-n]		t _{sub}	v	obj	(58)a
	d.	* <u>expl</u> aux			sub _[+n]	v	obj	-
	[+neg] e.	* <u>expl</u> aux		sub _[+n]	t _{sub}	v	obj	-
	f.	<u>expl</u> aux	sub _[+n]	t _{sub}	t _{sub}	v	obj	(59)a
intervening expletive	g.	* aux <u>expl</u>			sub _[-n]	v	obj	(58)b
	[-neg] h.	* aux <u>expl</u>		sub _[-n]	t _{sub}	v	obj	(58)b
	i.	* aux <u>expl</u>	sub _[-n]		t _{sub}	v	obj	(58)b
	j.	* aux <u>expl</u>			sub _[+n]	v	obj	(59)b
	[+neg] k.	* aux <u>expl</u>		sub _[+n]	t _{sub}	v	obj	(59)b
l.	* aux <u>expl</u>	sub _[+n]	t _{sub}	t _{sub}	v	obj	(59)b	

**intervening expletive
blocks licensing of
associate subject in
SpecTP**

**no licensing of TEC associate
subject in SpecNegP**

**no licensing of
TEC associate
subject in Spec ν P**

The hypothesis that the associate subject of a TEC must occur in SpecTP, irrespective of whether it is negative or non-negative, is corroborated by the fact that a negative associate subject does not make TECs possible in Mainland Scandinavian, where SpecNegP but not SpecTP is available. In other words, a TEC associate subject cannot be licensed in SpecNegP; the sentence in (61) is ungrammatical.

- (61) *Der har **ingen** sagt det. Da
there has nobody said that

However, at least some speakers of Swedish accept TECs if the associate subject is negative. Notably, the negative associate subject seems to require local licensing: The construction is only possible if the expletive appears in clause-initial position but not if it intervenes between the finite verb and the negative associate subject; see also section 4 below.

- (62) a. Det ska **ingen jävel** slå mina barn. Sw
 b. *I dag ska det **ingen jävel** slå mina barn.
today shall there no bastard beat my child

(David Håkanson, p.c., and Christer Platzack, p.c.)

3.4 Summary

Though there are two subject positions in the IP domain in Faroese I (section 2), they can only be filled simultaneously by an overt expletive (SpecAgrSP) and an associate subject (SpecTP) if the constituents are separated by an intervening verb (section 3.1). This was accounted for by the assumption that the associate subject in SpecTP requires local licensing: The finite verb needs to check the D-feature of the associate subject in SpecTP. This is only possible if there is no closer goal, i.e. if there is no overt expletive that intervenes between the finite verb and the associate subject.

The asymmetries between existential constructions and TECs with simple/complex tense (section 3.2) and negative/non-negative associate subject (section 3.3) showed that this licensing condition only applies to associate subjects in SpecTP in Faroese I. The sequence *expletive – associate subject* is acceptable as long as the associate subject occurs in a lower position (CompV^o and SpecNegP, respectively).

As discussed in the following section, Mainland Scandinavian data from around 1900 point to the conclusion that the co-occurrence restriction is actually not confined to SpecTP but applies to associate subjects in positions in which a TEC subject can be licensed.

4 A similar phenomenon in Mainland Scandinavian around 1900

While TECs are ungrammatical in present-day Mainland Scandinavian, (28) and (61) above, traditional grammars present data that show that TECs were possible with quantified and negative associate subjects in Mainland Scandinavian around 1900 (Diderichsen 1946, Ljunggren 1926, Mikkelsen 1911, Wallin 1936, and Western 1921; see also K. K. Christensen 1991).

(63) Der kan **mange** sige det. No
there can many say that (Falk & Torp 1900: 8)

(64) Der maa **ingen** sige det. Da
there must nobody say that (Diderichsen 1946: 187)

(65) Det kan **ingen** göra den saken bättre än han. Sw
there can nobody do this thing better than he (Wallin 1936: 368)

Likewise, quantified associate subjects could optionally precede a non-finite verb in existential constructions, and negative ones even had to do so, just as they do in present-day Danish and Swedish; see (53) above.

(66) a. Der har ligget **mange** under åben himmel i nat. Da
 b. Der har **mange** ligget under åben himmel i nat.
there have many laid under open sky last night
 (Mikkelsen 1911: 29)

(67) a. Der må da have været **nogen** hjemme. Da
 b. Der må da **nogen** have været hjemme.
there must really somebody have been at-home
 (Mikkelsen 1911: 29)

(68) a. *Det har varit **ingen** här. Sw
 b. Det har **ingen** varit här.
there has nobody been here (Wallin 1936: 368)

- (69) a. *Det har kommit **inga tidningar**. Sw
 b. Det har **inga tidningar** kommit.
there are no newspapers come (Ljunggren 1926: 323)

As shown in section 3.3 above, there is a special position for negative phrases to the left of a non-finite verb in Scandinavian, namely SpecNegP. Similarly, there would seem to be a special position for quantified phrases to the left of a non-finite verb, SpecQP. As shown by the example in (70) from Ljunggren (1926), a quantified object could precede or follow a non-finite verb; see also Western (1921: 221/22). Movement of a quantified object to the left of a non-finite verb, referred to as Quantifier Shift, was possible in all Scandinavian languages and still optionally applies in present-day Icelandic, (71); see Rögnvaldsson (1987), Jónsson (1996), Svenonius (2000), and Thráinsson (2007).

- (70) a. Jag har fátt **många tidningar** av honom. Sw
 b. Jag har **många tidningar** fátt av honom.
I have many newspapers received by him
 Ljunggren (1926: 323)

- (71) a. Strákarnir höfðu hent **miklu grjóti** í bílana. Ic
 b. ?Strákarnir höfðu **miklu grjóti** hent í bílana.
boys-the had much rock thrown in cars-the
 (Svenonius 2000: 262)

Van der Wurff (1999), Tanaka (2000) and Ingham (2003) report a restriction to negative associate subjects for Middle English expletive constructions similar to the one observed in former stages of Mainland Scandinavian: TECs and existential constructions with clause-medial associate subject were only possible with negative associate subjects. Based on van Kemenade (1997: 332), Ingham (2003: 437) accounts for this by assuming that the case feature normally associated with I° could be transmitted to the next functional head below it (Neg°), permitting licensing of an associate subject in SpecNegP.¹⁴

¹⁴ As v° is not a functional head, an associate subject could not remain in SpecvP; TECs with non-negative associate subject were thus ruled out.

Following Ingham (2003), the restriction to TECs with negative or quantified associate subject in Mainland Scandinavian around 1900 can be captured by the assumption that SpecTP was unavailable at that stage, just as it is in present-day Mainland Scandinavian, but that a quantified or negative associate subject could be licensed in SpecQP and SpecNegP, which is not possible anymore (see section 3.3). This is illustrated in (75) below. Like an associate subject in SpecTP in Faroese I, an associate subject in SpecQP or SpecNegP is taken here to require licensing by D-feature checking with the c-commanding finite verb.

Interestingly, Falk & Torp (1900: 8-10), Western (1921: 65) and Ljunggren (1926: 344) claim that an overt expletive is only acceptable in clause-initial position in TECs; see the (a)-examples in (72)-(74). If some other constituent is topicalized, an overt expletive cannot appear: Clause-medial co-occurrence of overt expletive and associate subject as in (72)b-(74)b is ungrammatical.

- (72) a. Der kan **ikke mange** tale bedre. No
 b. *Bedre kan der **ikke mange** tale.
better can there not many speak (Falk & Torp 1900: 10)

- (73) a. Der forlanger **ingen** det av dig. No
 b. *Det forlanger der **ingen** av dig.
it demand there nobody from you (Western 1921: 65)

- (74) a. Der har **mange** ønsket det samme. No
 b. *Det samme har der **mange** ønsket.
the same have there many wished (Western 1921: 65)

The above contrast suggests that licensing of an associate subject in SpecQP and SpecNegP has to be local: The associate subject cannot be licensed if an intervening overt expletive blocks D-feature checking by the finite verb; see (75).

(75) MSc 1900: TEC	CP AgrSP	–	SpecTP	Spec Neg/QP	SpecvP	V°	Comp	ex.
no intervening expletive	a.	*	<u>expl</u> aux			sub _[-n/q]	v obj	-
	[-n/q]	b.	* <u>expl</u> aux		sub _[-n/q]	t _{sub}	v obj	-
		c.	* <u>expl</u> aux	sub _[-n/q]		t _{sub}	v obj	-
		d.	* <u>expl</u> aux			sub _[+n/q]	v obj	-
	[+n/q]	e.	<u>expl</u> aux		sub _[+n/q]	t _{sub}	v obj	(73)a
		f.	* <u>expl</u> aux	sub _[+n/q]	t _{sub}	t _{sub}	v obj	-
intervening expletive		g.	* aux <u>expl</u>			sub _[-n/q]	v obj	-
	[-n/q]	h.	* aux <u>expl</u>		sub _[-n/q]	t _{sub}	v obj	-
		i.	* aux <u>expl</u>	sub _[-n/q]		t _{sub}	v obj	-
		j.	* aux <u>expl</u>			sub _[+n/q]	v obj	(73)a
	[+n/q]	k.	* aux <u>expl</u>		sub _[+n/q]	t _{sub}	v obj	(73)c
	l.	* aux <u>expl</u>	sub _[+n/q]	t _{sub}	t _{sub}	v obj	(73)c	

no SpecTP in
MSc 1900

no [-neg/-q] in
SpecNeg/QP

licensing of TEC
associate subject
in SpecNeg/QP

no licensing of
TEC associate
subject in SpecvP

intervening expletive blocks
licensing of associate
subject in SpecNeg/QP

Thus, the co-occurrence restriction on clause-medial overt expletives and associate subjects would seem to apply only to associate subjects in positions in which a TEC associate subject can be licensed: It applies to associate subjects in SpecTP in Faroese I, where TECs are possible with all types of subjects (see (36), (46)b and (59)b above), and to associate subjects in SpecNegP/SpecQP in former stages of Mainland Scandinavian, where TECs are restricted to negative and quantified subjects (see (72)b-(74)b above as well as (76)b and (78)b below). In contrast, in present-day Mainland Scandinavian and Faroese, where SpecNegP is not a licensing position for TEC subjects anymore, an overt expletive may intervene between the finite verb and the associate subject in SpecNegP (see section 3.3 and the examples in (50) above and (77) below). In

other words, the local licensing requirement is restricted to associate subjects in TEC subject positions.

Recall that in Faroese I, the associate subject of an existential construction cannot occur in SpecTP either if it is not separated from the overt expletive by an intervening verb; i.e. the associate subject of an existential construction requires local licensing, too. Similarly, Falk & Torp (1900: 10) present data that show that the clause-medial sequence *expletive – associate subject* was also ruled out for quantified associate subjects in existential constructions in former stages of Mainland Scandinavian.

- No*
- (76) a. Der har **fire mænd** redet over broen idag.
 b. *Idag har der **fire mænd** redet over broen.
 c. Idag har der redet **fire mænd** over broen.
today has there ridden four men over bridge-the
 (Falk & Torp 1900: 10)

If my proposal is on the right track and local licensing is generally required for associate subjects in positions where a TEC associate subject can be licensed, it is predicted that the sequence *expletive – associate subject* was ungrammatical in existential constructions with a negative associate subject in Mainland Scandinavian around 1900 although this sequence is grammatical in certain varieties of present-day Mainland Scandinavian; see (77) and footnote 11. This diachronic contrast is expected by the fact that SpecNegP was a licensing position for TEC associate subjects in former stages of Mainland Scandinavian, which it is not anymore; compare (61) with the examples in (63)-(65).

- (77) I dag har der **ingen hunde** været i haven. *Da*
today have there no dogs been in garden-the

Unfortunately, I could not find an equivalent example in the traditional grammars mentioned above. But David Håkanson (p.c.), who seems to be able to license an associate subject in SpecNegP (see (62) above), just as it was possible in Mainland Scandinavian around 1900, rejects the sequence *expletive -*

negative associate subject in existential constructions, supporting the above hypothesis.¹⁵

- (78) a. Det har **inga hundar** varit i trädgården. Sw
 b. *Idag har det **inga hundar** varit i trädgården.
today have there no dogs been in garden-the
 (David Håkanson, p.c.)

5 Conclusion

Though there are two subject positions in the IP domain in Faroese I, SpecAgrSP for the expletive and SpecTP for the associate subject (see section 2), these positions can only be filled simultaneously as long as the expletive does not disturb local licensing: An associate subject in SpecTP has to be licensed by checking its D-feature against a c-commanding verb; this is only possible as long as there is no D-feature closer to the finite verb, i.e. as long as there is no overt expletive that intervenes between the finite verb and the associate subject (see section 3.1). Asymmetries between existential constructions and TECs with simple/complex tense and non-negative/negative associate subject show that the licensing condition only applies to associate subjects in SpecTP in Faroese I. The sequence *expletive - associate subject* is possible if the associate subject occupies a lower position, CompV° and SpecNegP, respectively; see sections 3.2 and 3.3. Data from Mainland Scandinavian around 1900 point out that the co-occurrence restriction is actually not confined to associate subjects in SpecTP but generally applies to associate subjects in positions in which a TEC associate subject can be licensed.

¹⁵ For Christer Platzack (p.c.), who also accepts the example in (62)a, the contrast in (78) is not that sharp as he judges (78)a only marginally acceptable; see also footnote 11.

References

- Bentzen, Kristine. 2007. Order and Structure in Embedded clauses in Northern Norwegian. Ph.D., CASTL, University of Tromsø.
- Bentzen, Kristine, Piotr Garbacz, Caroline Heycock and Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson. 2009. On variation in Faroese verb placement. *Nordlyd Tromsø University Working Papers on Language and Linguistics* 36, 78-102.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan D. and Dianne Jonas. 1996. Subject positions and the roles of TP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27, 195-236.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan and Höskuldur Thráinsson. 1998. Two heads aren't always better than one. *Syntax* 1, 37-71.
- Bures, Anton. 1992. (Re)cycling expletives and other sentences. Ms., MIT.
- Bures, Anton. 1993. There is an argument for a cycle at LF, here. *Proceedings of CLS* 28, Vol. 2, 14-35. University of Chicago.
- Christensen, Kristi Koch. 1986. Norwegian *ingen*: a case of post-syntactic lexicalization. In *Scandinavian Syntax*, ed. Östen Dahl and Anders Holmberg, 21-35. Stockholm: Institute of Linguistics, University of Stockholm.
- Christensen, Kristi Koch. 1987. Modern Norwegian *ingen* and the ghost of an Old Norse particle. In *Proceeding of the Seventh Biennial Conference of Teachers of Scandinavian Studies in Great Britain and Northern Ireland*, ed. Robin D. S. Allan and Michael P. Barnes, 1-17. University College London.
- Christensen, Kristi Koch. 1991. AGR, adjunction, and the structure of Scandinavian existential sentences. *Lingua* 84, 137-158.
- Christensen, Ken Ramshøj. 2005. *Interfaces: Negation – Syntax – Brain*. Ph.D., University of Aarhus.
- Diderichsen, Paul. 1946. *Elementær dansk grammatik*. København: Nordisk Forlag.
- Engels, Eva. 2009. Microvariation in object positions. Negative Shift in Scandinavian. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 83, 83-102.
- Engels, Eva. To appear. Scandinavian negative indefinites and cyclic linearization. To appear in *Syntax*.
- Engels, Eva and Sten Vikner. 2007. Object Shift, Scrambling, and Optimality Theory. Talk given at the *Workshop on Formal and Functional Approaches to Object Positions*, University of Aarhus.

- Falk, Hjalmar and Alf Torp. 1900. *Dansk-Norskens Syntax i historisk fremstilling*. Kristiania: Aschehoug.
- Holmberg, Anders. 1986. *Word Order and Syntactic Features in the Scandinavian Languages and English*. Ph.D., University of Stockholm.
- Holmberg, Anders. 1999. Remarks on Holmberg's generalization. *Studia Linguistica* 53, 1-39.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1991. Expletives: a comparative study of English and Icelandic. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 47, 1-88.
- Ingham, Richard. 2003. The development of Middle English expletive negative sentences. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 101, 411-452.
- Jonas, Dianne. 1994. The TP parameter in Scandinavian syntax. In *Proceedings of the XIVth Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics and the VIIIth Conference of Nordic and General Linguistics, Special Session on Scandinavian Syntax*, ed. Cecilia Hedlund and Anders Holmberg, 33-59. Gothenburg Papers in Theoretical Linguistics, Gothenburg University.
- Jonas, Dianne. 1996a. Clause structure and verb syntax in Scandinavian and English. Ph.D., Harvard University.
- Jonas, Dianne. 1996b. Clause structure, expletives, and verb movement. In *Minimal ideas: syntactic studies in the minimalist framework*, ed. Werner Abraham, Samuel David Epstein, Höskuldur Thráinsson and Jan-Wouter Zwart, 167-188. Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Jónsson, Johannes Gísli. 1996. Clausal Architecture and Case in Icelandic. Ph.D., University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Kemenade, Ans van. 1997. V2 and embedded topicalisation in Old and Middle English. In *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, ed. Ans van Kemenade and Nigel Vincent, 326-352. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Koenenman, Olaf and Ad Neeleman. 2001. Predication, Verb Movement and the Distribution of Expletives. *Lingua* 111, 189-233.
- Koster, Jan and Jan-Wouter Zwart. 2000. Transitive Expletive Constructions and the Object Shift Parameter. In *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, ed. Helen de Hoop and Ton van der Wouden, 159-170. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ljunggren, Ragnar. 1926. *Om den opersonliga konstruktionen*. Uppsala: Berlings nya boktryckeri.

- Maling, Joan. 1987. Existential sentences in Swedish and Icelandic: Reference to thematic roles. *Working papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 28, 1-21.
- Mikkelsen, Kristian. 1911. *Dansk Ordføjningslære. Med sproghistoriske Tillæg*. København: Lehmann & Stage.
- Pedersen, Karen Margrethe and Viggo Sørensen. To appear. Dialekter. In *Dansk Sproghistorie, Volume 2*, ed. Ebba Hjorth, Henrik Galberg Jacobsen and Bent Jørgensen. Det danske sprog- og litteraturselskab.
- Platzack, Christer. 1983. Existential sentences in English, Swedish, German and Icelandic. In *Papers from the Seventh Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*, ed. Fred Karlsson, 80-100. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Platzack, Christer. The Scandinavian languages and the null-subject parameter. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5, 377-401.
- Richards, Marc. 2006. Weak pronouns, object shift and multiple spell-out: Evidence for phases at the PF-interface. In *Minimalist Essays*, ed. Cedric Boeckx, 160-181. Amsterdam/New York: Benjamins.
- Rögvaldsson, Eiríkur. 1987. OV Word Order in Icelandic. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Biennial Conference of Teachers of Scandinavian Studies in Great Britain and Northern Ireland*, ed. Robin D. S. Allan and Michael P. Barnes, 33-49. University College London.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Á. 1989. Verbal syntax and Case in Icelandic. Ph.D., University of Lund.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Á. 1991. Icelandic Case-marked PRO and the licensing of lexical arguments. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9, 327-363.
- Svenonius, Peter. 2000. Quantifier movement in Icelandic. In *The Derivation of VO and OV*, ed. Peter Svenonius, 255-292. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Svenonius, Peter. 2002. Strains of Negation. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 69, 121-146.
- Tanaka, Tomoyuki. 2000. On the development of transitive expletive constructions in the history of English. *Lingua* 110, 473-495.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2007. *The syntax of Icelandic*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur, Hjalmar Petersen, Jógvan í Lon Jacobsen and Zakaris Svabo Hansen. 2004. *Faroese – an overview and reference grammar*. Tórshavn: Føroya Fróðskaparfelag.

- Tomaselli, Alessandra. 1990. COMP^o as a licensing head: An argument based on cliticization. In *Grammar in Progress, GLOW Essays for Henk van Riemsdijk*, ed. Joan Mascaró and Marina Nespó, 433-445. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Vangsnes, Øystein. A. 2002. Icelandic expletive constructions and the distribution of subject types. In *Subjects, Expletives, and the Extended Projection Principle*, ed. Peter Svenonius, 43-69. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vikner, Sten. 1990. Verb Movement and the Licensing of NP-positions in the Germanic Languages. Ph.d., University of Geneva.
- Vikner, Sten. 1995. *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Wallin, Isak. 1936. *Om det grammatiska subjektet: En semologisk och morfologisk studie*. Stockholm: Fritze.
- Western, August. 1921. *Norsk riksmålsgrammatikk*. Kristiania: Aschehoug.
- Wiklund, Anna-Lena, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, Kristine Bentzen and Thorbjörg Hróarsdóttir. 2007. Rethinking Scandinavian verb movement. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 10, 203–233.
- Wulff, Wim van der. 1999. Objects and verbs in modern Icelandic and fifteenth-century English: A word order parallel and its causes. *Lingua* 109, 237-265.