CHAPTER 10
THE SCANDINAVIAN LANGUAGES
ANDERS HOLMBERG AND CHRISTER PLATZACK

1 INTRODUCTION

The Scandinavian languages—Danish, Faroese, Icelandic, Norwegian, and Swedish—are closely related Germanic languages (Indo-European), spoken in the northern part of Europe. To be more precise, Norwegian and Swedish are spoken on the Scandinavian peninsula, Danish is spoken in Jutland and on the Danish islands north of Germany, Icelandic is spoken on Iceland, and Faroese is spoken on the Faroe Islands. Not quite 20 million people have a Scandinavian language as their mother tongue, with Swedish (9 million) as the most widely spoken of them and Faroese (40,000) as the least. Whereas Danish, Icelandic, Norwegian, and Swedish are national languages, Faroese is a provincial language, the Faroe Islands being a semi-independent possession of Denmark. Iceland and the Faroe Islands were colonized by Scandinavians around A.D. 800; at about the same time, Scandinavian Vikings also settled on Orkney and Shetland, where a sixth Scandinavian language developed, known as Norn; it became extinct around 1700.

In the Middle Ages, all Scandinavian languages were mutually comprehensible. Speakers of Mainland Scandinavian (Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish) are still able to make themselves understood to each other when speaking their native tongue, although the rapid morphophonological development of Danish has gradually increased the problems for other Scandinavians in understanding spoken Danish. Icelandic and Faroese have had their own developments, and these languages differ enough from the Mainland Scandinavian ones to require mutual learning for comprehension.

The countries where the Scandinavian languages are spoken constitute a socio-cultural area, sharing much of their history and displaying many common culture traits, as well as comparable standards of living. In many respects, the languages are no more different than dialects of a single language may be. However, the fact that the Scandinavian languages are national languages has led to the unusual situation that these highly similar languages are fairly well described, and for the last twenty years an intense research on comparative Scandinavian syntax has taken place. Recently the current grammatical knowledge of Norwegian and Swedish has been codified in two comprehensive grammars, Norsk referansegrammatikk (c. 1,220 pp., Faarlund, et al. 1997) and Svenska Akademien grammatik (c. 2,700 pp., Teleman et al. 1999), respectively; a grammar of the corresponding size for Danish is almost finished (Hansen and Heltft in press).

From a syntactic point of view, the Scandinavian languages roughly divide into two groups, which, following a suggestion by Haugen (1976: 23), we refer to as Insular Scandinavian (Icelandic, partly Faroese, Old Scandinavian) and Mainland Scandinavian (Danish, Norwegian, Swedish), respectively. In general, the Insular Scandinavian languages have a richer inflectional system, which mainly accounts for the syntactic differences observed, as shown in Holmberg and Platzack (1995). Some of these differences are discussed in the bulk of this chapter. However, before proceeding, we point out some important syntactic properties that are common to all Scandinavian languages, both Insular and Mainland Scandinavian.

2 SYNTACTIC PROPERTIES COMMON TO ALL SCANDINAVIAN LANGUAGES

Like all the Germanic languages except English, the Scandinavian languages are verb-second languages, meaning that, at most, one constituent may precede the tensed verb of the main clause. Consider the Swedish examples in (1); corresponding examples can be given for all the other Scandinavian languages. In the examples, the tensed verb is underlined, and the constituent in front of it is in italics:
A third syntactic property at the sentential level, common to all the Scandinavian languages, is the placement of the object (underlined) after the nonfinite verb and in front of adverbials of time, location, manner, and other content adverbials (in italics); see the Swedish example in (3):

(3) Han hade hittat pengarna under sängen igår.

he had found money-the under bed-the yesterday

'He had found the money under the bed yesterday.'

There is no difference between main and embedded clauses in this respect: unless it is in first position, the object always follows the nonfinite verb.3

A fourth syntactic property of all the Scandinavian languages is the use of prepositions and not postpositions (cf. under sängen 'under the bed' in (3)). In all the languages, the preposition may also govern clauses, finite or infinitival:

(4) a. efter att ha öppnat brevet
    after to have opened letter-the
    after having opened the letter

b. efter att hon hade öppnat brevet
    after that she had opened letter-the

All the Scandinavian languages have what has been known as Object Shift, illustrated in (5a): a weak pronounal object (underlined) may occur to the left of sentential adverbials (italics) that otherwise precede the object (5b); compare (5a) and (5c):

(5) a. Han köpte den inte.
    he bought it not
    'He did not buy it.'

b. Han köpte inte boken.
    he bought not book-the
    'He didn't buy the book.'

c. *Han köpte boken inte.4
    he bought book-the not

Common to all the Scandinavian languages, furthermore, is the presence of a possessive reflexive sin (Han tvättade sig bil 'He washed his car', he = his compare Han tvättade hans bil 'he washed his car', he = his), the use of inflectional morphemes on the noun for both number and definiteness (häst-ar-na 'horse-s-the'),

The reason for placing a particular phrase in first position is mainly pragmatic; often the choice is an effect of the unmarked distribution of information within a clause where the information flow goes from more thematic to less thematic, where information is thematic when it is shared by speaker and hearer.

A second property at the sentential level that is common to all the Scandinavian languages is the requirement that a referential subject must be overt, even if its reference is easily deduced from the context. This is shown for Swedish in (3); note that the subject pronoun in the second clause (underlined) cannot be left out in the corresponding example in any of the Scandinavian languages:

(2) Igår köpte Johan en ny cykel. Den ställde *han i köket.

Yesterday bought Johan a new bike. It put he in kitchen-the

'Yesterday Johan bought a new bike. He put it in the kitchen.'
3 Word Order at the Sentence Level

3.1 Introduction

Scandinavian word order at the sentence level is the subject of this section. Generally speaking, the Scandinavian languages are almost identical with respect to

sentential word order, although there are some interesting differences, mainly between Icelandic and modern Mainland Scandinavian.

There is wide consensus today that the clause is universally structured as in (6):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CP} & \\
\text{TP} & \\
\text{VP} &
\end{align*}
\]

VP is the domain where deep semantic roles are assigned (the Agent and Patient of an event, e.g.); TP is the locus of tense and event structure, including sentence adverbials; and CP is a domain where the clause is anchored to the context and the speaker’s point of view, and where sentence force is indicated, distinguishing declarative, interrogative, and so on. For the Scandinavian languages, the structure in (6) is mirrored in the word order of the clause, in the sense that the topic, as well as force indicators, are usually found at the left edge of the clause, and semantic roles not expressed by the subject are usually found at the end of the clause, together with event-modifying content adverbials. In our account of word-order properties, we discuss the domains in the order of Merge; that is, we start with VP.

3.2 The Verb Phrase

3.2.1 Overview

The schematic word order of the verb phrase for all the modern Scandinavian languages is outlined in (7a), with examples from Icelandic and Swedish in (7b-c); as we will see, at this level of abstraction, the Scandinavian word order is identical to the English one:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(7)} & \\
\text{a. VERB OBJECT CONTENT ADVERBIALS} & \\
\text{b. skilja bilinn eftr heima á morgun. (Icelandic)} & \\
\text{c. lamma bilen hemma i morgon (Swedish)} & \\
\text{leave car-the home tomorrow} &
\end{align*}
\]

There is no real understanding of how the content adverbials are represented structurally. However, assuming that the computation of the clause starts with the
verb and that it first merges with the internal argument, the adverbials must be in Spec-VP, producing the VP-structure outlined in (8):

(8)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{heima} \quad V' \\
\text{á morgun} \quad V' \\
\text{skilja efir} \quad \text{blinn} \\
\end{array}
\]

Since both the (nonfinite) verb and the object precede the content adverbials, we conclude that both the verb and the object are raised to higher positions. See Josefson and Platzack (1998) for further arguments and Johnson (1991) and Koizumi (1993) for a similar account of the English facts.

To determine where the verb and the object are raised, we have to consider also the position of the external argument. There is wide consensus today (Arad 1999; Chomsky 1995, 1999, etc.) that the external argument is merged as a specifier of little v, schematically as in (9), where the boldface DP is the external argument and CA represents the content adverbials:

(9)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{CA} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{Object} \\
\end{array}
\]

To avoid a violation of the Shortest Move principle, we will assume that the object is attracted to a Spec-vP lower than the external argument, as indicated by the arrow in the diagram; see Chomsky (1998) for a discussion. The verb is presumably attracted by a higher head, outside of vP, using v° as an intermediate landing site. We discuss this raising later.

3.2.2 The Verb Particle

The main difference between the Scandanavian languages at VP is the order of verb particles and the object. Danish almost always must have the particle after the object, whereas Swedish must have it before the object. Compare the examples in (10), where the particle is in italics, and the object is underlined:

(10)

a. Han tog et lommeterkloede op. (Danish)
   he took an handkerchief up

b. Han tog upp en nåsduke. (Swedish)
   he took up an handkerchief

Norwegian and Icelandic have both possibilities, as shown by the following examples from Svenonius (1996):

(11)

a. Han spiste terrfiskem opp. (Norwegian)
   he ate dry fish-the up

b. Han spiste opp terrfiskem.
   he ate up dry fish-the
   'He ate up the dried fish.'

(12)

a. Ëg gerði nokkr ðila upp. (Icelandic)
   I fixed some cars up

b. Ëg gerði upp nokkr ðila.
   I fixed up some cars
   'I fixed up some cars.'

When the object is a weak pronoun, it is placed before the particle in Danish, Norwegian, and Icelandic; in Swedish, it still tends to follow the particle. Evidently, the optionality of particle shift of DPs in Norwegian and Icelandic is similar to that found in English:

(13)

a. Hun har hengt det opp. (Norwegian)
   she has hung it up

b. Hon har hängt upp det. (Swedish)
   she has hung up it

Finally, it should be mentioned that the particle and the object, independently of their relative order, always precedes content adverbials (14a, b) and that the verb
is always left-adjacent to the particle, except when it is in the verb-second position (14c):

(14) a. Hun har hengt billede opp på veggen. (Norwegian)
    she has hung picture-the up on wall-the

b. Hun har hengt opp billede på veggen. (Norwegian)
    she has hung up picture-the on wall-the

c. Till slut åt Kalle verkligen opp torrfisken. (Swedish)
    at last ate Kalle really up dry.fish-the

We abstain from presenting an account of the obligatory pronoun shift around the particle in Danish, Norwegian, and Icelandic and concentrate on discussing some thoughts about the optionality of DP particle shift in Norwegian and Icelandic, the obligatory order object–particle in Danish, and the obligatory order particle–object in Swedish. The account we present is a modification of Svenonius (1996), who does not discuss the obligatory orders in Swedish and Danish and does not consider the placement of the particle and the object in front of the content adverbials.

Partly following Svenonius (1996), we assume that the particle merges with the object DP and that this combination merges with the verb, yielding (15):

(15) [VP spise [VP opp torrfisk]]
    eat up dry.fish-the

As mentioned, the verb raises to a position outside of VP, passing through v, and the object raises to a lower Spec-VP. Since the particle precedes content adverbials, it is assumed that it clitics to the verb and raises with the verb as a free rider at least as far as v. This gives us object–particle order in case the particle is stranded in v, and particle–object order in case the particle follows the verb out of VP, as indicated in (16); we use embedded clauses to avoid verb-second effects:

(16) a. han vu teg, [VP tømmeretklede [VP * op tømmeretklede [VP that he took an handkerchief up fra lommen ...]]] (Danish)
    from pocket-the

b. att han vu [VP teg opp] [VP tømmeretklede [VP that he took up an handkerchief fraen fickan ...]] (Swedish)
    from pocket-the

As shown in the next section, the difference between Swedish and Danish in (16) provides for a difference with respect to Object Shift in these languages in constructions with the particle.

To account for the optional word order in Icelandic and Norwegian, where the counterparts of both (16a) and (16b) are well-formed, we obviously have to design our description in such a way that stranding the particle either in v or outside of vP is equally costly. We do not provide a discussion of these matters here.

3.3 The Middle Field (TP)

The middle field is built up around the T(ense) P(hrase), presumably containing a number of positions related to mood, tense, and aspect, as suggested in Cinque (1999). In addition, we find different kinds of sentence adverbials here, including the negation. In our presentation, we concentrate on some points of variation between the Scandinavian languages—namely, Object Shift, the position of the verbs that are not in the V2-position, and a middle-field position for the subject.

3.3.1 Object Shift

In all the Scandinavian languages, an object may occur in the middle field, preceding the negation and other sentence adverbials, under certain conditions. See Holmberg and Platzer (1995: chap. 6) and Hellan and Platzer (1999) for overviews. In Mainland Scandinavian, only pronominal objects may occur in this position, while in Icelandic any definite DP object may do so. As Holmberg (1999) has shown, Object Shift is prevented across any phonologically visible nonadjunct category that c-commands the object position in vP. Compare the well-formed example in (17) with the ungrammatical ones in (18), where Object Shift is blocked by the presence of a verb (18a), a particle (18b), a preposition (18c), or another argument (18d). As (18e, f) show, the pronominal indirect object alone, or both the indirect and the direct object, may shift:

(17) Jag kysste henne inte tømmeretklede. (Swedish)
    I kissed her not

(18) a. *att jag henne inte kysste tømmeretklede. (Swedish)
    that I her not kissed

b. *Jag skrev det inte upp tømmeretklede.
    I wrote it not up

c. *Jag talade henne inte med tømmeretklede.
    I spoke her not with
d. *Jag gav den inte Elsa t관.
   I gave it not Elsa

e. Jag gav henne inte den.
   I gave her not it

f. Jag gav henne den inte.
   I gave her it not

In Danish, Icelandic, and Norwegian, where the object may or must be placed in front of the particle, as shown in the previous section, Object Shift in cases like (18b) is well-formed.

(19) Jeg skrev det måske ikke t관 op. (Danish)
   I wrote it maybe not up

Holmberg (1999) argues that Object Shift is a P(honetic) F(orm) operation and that an important prerequisite is that the shifted object is not a focus. See Jøsefsson (2003) for an alternative view.

Icelandic is exceptional among the Scandinavian languages in that Object Shift applies freely to full definite DPs, as well as to weak pronouns, provided the DPs are not focused:

(20) a. Æg les alderi þessar boekur (Icelandic)
    I read never these books

b. Æg les þessar boekur alderi.
   I read these books never

See Holmberg (1999) and Chomsky (2000) for recent attempts to account for this optionality.

3.3.2 Position of the Verb in the Middle Field

In main clauses, the finite verb in Scandinavian is always raised to the C-domain (verb second), as we discuss in the next section. In embedded clauses, the Mainland Scandinavian finite verb usually occupies a lower position within the middle field (21), and the nonfinite verb never moves higher than the middle field (22a), unless it is topicalized, as, for example, in (22b), taken from Holmberg (1999); this is presumably a case of VP fronting.

(21) att John faktiskt hade köpt boken (Swedish, the same in Danish and Norwegian)
   that John actually had bought book-the

As shown in (22a), the nonfinite verb in Mainland Scandinavian control infinitives is found after the negation and other sentence adverbials. In Icelandic, in contrast, the infinitive precedes the negation in control infinitives but follows the negation in case it is governed by an auxiliary:

(22) a. (Han lovade) att inte låsa boken. (Swedish; the same in Danish and Norwegian)
   he promised to not read book-the
   *He promised not to read the book.'

b. Kysts henne har jag inte. (bara hållit henne i handen). (Swedish)
   kissed her have I not only held her by hand-the
   *Kissed her I haven't (only held her by the hand).'

The difference between Mainland Scandinavian and Icelandic in control infinitives with respect to the position of the infinitival verb vis-à-vis the negation and other sentence adverbials can be accounted for if we assume that the Icelandic infinitive in control infinitives is raised to the C-domain, whereas the Mainland Scandinavian infinitive is stuck in the middle field. Judging from the surface order, the Mainland Scandinavian infinitive, as well as the tensed verb in embedded clauses, is raised to a position below NegP, whereas the Icelandic infinitive is raised to a position above NegP (and other sentence adverbials). We assume the Mainland Scandinavian position to be T^p and the Icelandic position to be F^p; see section 3.4.10

3.3.3 Floating Subjects

With the exception of Danish, all the Scandinavian languages allow for floating subjects. Because they are verb-second languages, we expect to find the subject immediately after the finite verb when it is not in first position, as is illustrated in (24a); in this and the following examples, the subject is in italics and the adverbials are underlined:

(24) a. (Han lovade) att inte låsa boken. (Swedish; the same in Danish and Norwegian)
   he promised to not read book-the
   *He promised not to read the book.'
(24) Nu borde *Kalle* väl faktiskt inte säga mer. (Swedish)
    now should Kalle actually not say more

As we argue in the next section, the position of the subject immediately after the
finite verb is a position within the C-domain, presumably Spec-FinP.
However, the subject in (24) may also occur further to the right, as shown in (25a–c):

    now should probably Kalle actually not say more

b. Nu borde *väl faktiskt Kalle* inte säga mer.
    now should probably actually Kalle not say more

c. Nu borde *väl faktiskt inte Kalle* säga mer.
    now should probably actually not Kalle say more

Since we do not want to have sentence adverbials both in the C-domain and in
the middle field, we will assume that the subject has not raised to Spec-FinP in
cases like (25) but is stuck in Spec-TP. This assumption is supported by the fact
that the relative order of sentence adverbials is the same, whether they precede
or follow the subject, as indicated in (24) and (25).

3.4 The Left Periphery

3.4.1 Introduction

The initial part of the sentence, constituting the highest part of sentence structure,
here called the left periphery, contains several projections of features that regulate
the place of the sentence in its context. Following Rizzi (1997) we discern a Force
Phrase (ForceP), which is a projection of the sentence type feature, indicating
sentence type (declarative, interrogative, imperative), and a Finite Phrase (FinP)
projected of the finiteness feature that regulates the subject–predicate relation and
anchors the utterance to the time, location, and point of view of the speaker;
without this anchoring, a statement cannot be truth evaluated. In many languages,
including the Scandinavian ones, FinP also hosts an EPP feature, meaning that it
must have a specifier. Encompassed between ForceP and FinP are projections for
Topic and Focus, yielding the universal structure of the left periphery outlined in (26):

(26) ForceP
    Forceo
    TopP
    Topo
    FocP
    Foco
    FinP
    Fino
    TP

In Rizzi’s conception of the left periphery, based on Italian data, there are Topic
phrases both above and below the Focus phrase. The structure in (26) is enough
for our purposes, however, and furthermore it is not clear that the Scandinavian
languages offer support for multiple Topic phrases.

Later we discuss a number of syntactic differences between Mainland Scan-
dinavian and Icelandic which all involve the left periphery. As we will see, these
differences are the results of a single inflectional difference between these lan-
guages: the finite verb in Icelandic, but not in Mainland Scandinavian, is inflected
for person. Building on ideas in Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) and Pe-
setsy and Torrego (2001), we assume that the person inflection hosts an un-
interpretable finiteness feature uFin. For Mainland Scandinavian, which does not
have person inflection, the feature uFin is contained in the nominative DP.

Two additional assumptions about the left periphery are needed: as men-
tioned, all the Scandinavian languages are verb-second languages, which means
that Fino must be filled; this might be a trivial phonological property, according
to Chomsky (1999), with no deeper syntactic implication besides word order,
although the consequence in the case of Icelandic is that the uninterpretable
feature uFin is raised to Fino as a free rider and thus is eliminated. We also assume
that all the Scandinavian languages are alike in that FinP hosts an EPP feature
that attracts an element with phonological features.

It follows from the discussion so far that both the head and the specifier of
FinP must be filled in a Scandinavian language. The syntactic differences (dis-
cussed later) all result from the single parametric difference: the location of uFin
in the person inflection of the verb in Icelandic and in the nominative DP in
Mainland Scandinavian.

3.4.2 Expletive Subject

Like English, Mainland Scandinavian must have a visible subject in all finite
clauses, expletive or real. Icelandic, in contrast, must have a visible element in
front of the finite verb, but there is no obligation for this element to be a subject.
Consider the examples in (27) and (28): in (27) the Swedish example is introduced by an expletive subject det 'it', whereas the Icelandic example, which apparently has the same structure, is introduced by the filler word það. The difference between the expletive subject and the filler is evident when the sentence is introduced by an adverbial or any other constituent that is a nonsubject. In this case the expletive subject in Swedish inverts with the finite verb, whereas the Icelandic filler must be absent:

(27) a. Det regnade igår. (Swedish)
   b. það rigndi í gær. (Icelandic)
   It rained yesterday

(28) a. Ígår regnade *(det). (Swedish)
   b. Í gær rigndi *(það). (Icelandic)
   yesterday rained it

This difference follows from the assumptions about the left periphery presented previously. In both Swedish and Icelandic, the finite verb must be in Fin⁰, due to the verb-second requirement. Icelandic has person agreement with the feature uFin, which follows the verb to Fin⁰ as a free rider. In this position uFin is checked by the finite feature and deleted. The EPP feature of FinP forces the insertion of það in Spec-FinP, or the fronting of some other element of the clause, like the adverbial in (28b). There is no place or function for það when í gær is fronted. See Sigurðsson (2001) for a partly different view.

Consider next the Swedish examples. After raising the finite verb to Fin⁰, the Swedish grammar still has to eliminate the EPP feature of FinP and the uFin feature of the expletive det. Placing det in Spec-FinP fulfills both demands at the same time. The fronting of the adverbial in (28a) has no consequences for FinP; in particular, the expletive subject is still needed in Spec-FinP.

It was mentioned in connection with our discussion of the Icelandic example (28b) that the raising of the adverbial í gær 'yesterday' to Spec-FinP was triggered by EPP in FinP: if the adverbial is not fronted, a first-position filler það must be inserted in Spec-FinP. Since Spec-FinP is filled by the expletive subject in the corresponding Swedish example (28a), we conclude that the fronted adverbial in (28a) must be in a position above Spec-FinP, presumably in Spec-TopP. Whether or not the adverbial in Icelandic is vacuously raised from Spec-FinP to Spec-TopP is a question we do not want to answer here. More important for our discussion is the observation that the finite verb in (28a) cannot remain in Fin⁰, as it presumably does in the Icelandic example (28b), but must raise to a higher head, maybe Top⁰. This raising, which preserves verb second, can be seen as a consequence of Shortest Move: the subject det is closer to Spec-TopP than the adverbial ígår, and hence the raising of the adverbial should be banned. However, the subsequent raising of the finite verb removes the obstacle, according to the Principle of Minimal Compliance (Richards 1998). See Platzack (2004).

3.4.3 Transitive Expletives
As is evident from the discussion in the previous section, Swedish (but not Icelandic) has an expletive subject; Icelandic það, seemingly corresponding to Swedish det in (27), is simply a filler of Spec-FinP, whereas Swedish det has nominative Case and thus the uninterpretable feature uFin, making it a real subject. As a consequence, it must be moved to Spec-FinP to eliminate uFin. In Icelandic, where uFin is a part of the verb inflection, no single DP is forced to move to Spec-Fin. In particular, the subject of a transitive verb may remain lower down in the structure, in which case the filler það is inserted into Spec-FinP to eliminate the EPP feature of FinP, which will produce sentences like (29a), known as the Transitive Expletive Construction; see Sigurðsson (1989), Vikner (1995), and Bobaljik and Jonas (1996). The corresponding Swedish sentence is ungrammatical, due to the impossibility of eliminating the nominative feature uFin in the "real" subject:

(29) a. það hefur einhver étó hækarlínn. (Icelandic)
   b. *Det har någon stör hajen. (Swedish)
   it has someone eaten shark-the

3.4.4 Stylistic Fronting
The raising of the adverbial í gær 'yesterday' to Spec-FinP in (28b) is available in Icelandic but not in Swedish, as should be obvious from the previous discussion; the EPP feature of FinP must be checked by a subject in Spec-FinP in Swedish, otherwise the feature uFin will remain, ruling out the derivation. This restriction is not found in Icelandic, where uFin is part of the person agreement of the finite verb and hence is deleted when the verb raises to Fin⁰. Since the EPP is satisfied by any phonological material in Spec-FinP, only independent principles like Shortest Move will determine which element is fronted in Icelandic. See Holmberg (2000) for a discussion of these matters. In the general case, the element closest to Spec-FinP must be selected; thus when the subject is available, it is the subject that is raised. In such cases the Icelandic example is identical to the Swedish one. When the subject for some reason is not present, or remains in some lower position of the clause, however, an adverbial, the object, the predicative, or the nonfinite verb is raised to Spec-FinP. This fronting, which is easier to detect in embedded clauses, is known as Stylistic Fronting; see Holmberg (2000) for references, and consider the alternative account in Sigurðsson (2001). Some ex-
Consider the examples in (27) and (28); in (27) the Swedish example is introduced by an expletive subject det ‘it’, whereas the Icelandic example, which apparently has the same structure, is introduced by the filler word hef. The difference between the expletive subject and the filler is evident when the sentence is introduced by an adverbial or any other constituent that is a nonsubject. In this case the expletive subject in Swedish inverts with the finite verb, whereas the Icelandic filler must be absent:

(27) a. Det regnade igår. (Swedish)
   b. Hef einhver étíð hákarlinn. (Icelandic)

(28) a. Igår regnade *({det}). (Swedish)
   b. I gær rigendt (*hef). (Icelandic)

This difference follows from the assumptions about the left periphery presented previously. In both Swedish and Icelandic, the finite verb must be in FinP, due to the verb-second requirement. Icelandic has person agreement with the feature uFin, which follows the verb to FinP as a free rider. In this position uFin is checked by the finite feature and deleted. The EPP feature of FinP forces the insertion of hef in Spec-FinP, or the fronting of some other element of the clause, like the adverbial in (28b). There is no place or function for hef when i gær is fronted. See Sigurðsson (2003) for a partly different view.

Consider next the Swedish examples. After raising the finite verb to FinP, the Swedish grammar still has to eliminate the EPP feature of FinP and the uFin feature of the expletive det. Placing det in Spec-FinP fulfills both demands at the same time. The fronting of the adverbial in (28b) has no consequences for FinP; in particular, the expletive subject is still needed in Spec-FinP.

It was mentioned in connection with our discussion of the Icelandic example (28b) that the raising of the adverbial i gær ‘yesterday’ to Spec-FinP was triggered by EPP in FinP; if the adverbial is not fronted, a first-position filler hef must be inserted in Spec-FinP. Since Spec-FinP is filled by the expletive subject in the corresponding Swedish example (28a), we conclude that the fronted adverbial in (28a) must be in a position above Spec-FinP, presumably in Spec-TopP. Whether or not the adverbial in Icelandic is vacuously raised from Spec-FinP to Spec-TopP is a question we do not want to answer here. More important for our discussion is the observation that the finite verb in (28a) cannot remain in FinP, as it presumably does in the Icelandic example (28b), but must raise to a higher head, maybe TopP. This raising, which preserves verb second, can be seen as a consequence of Shortest Move: the subject det is closer to Spec-TopP than the adverbial igår, and hence the raising of the adverbial should be banned. However, the subsequent raising of the finite verb removes the obstacle, according to the Principle of Minimal Compliance (Richards 1998). See Platzack (2004).

3.4.3 Transitive Expletives

As is evident from the discussion in the previous section, Swedish (but not Icelandic) has an expletive subject; Icelandic hef, seemingly corresponding to Swedish det in (27), is simply a filler of Spec-FinP, whereas Swedish det has nominative Case and thus the uninterpretable feature uFin, making it a real subject. As a consequence, it must be moved to Spec-FinP to eliminate uFin. In Icelandic, where uFin is a part of the verb inflection, no single DP is forced to move to Spec-Fin. In particular, the subject of a transitive verb may remain lower down in the structure, in which case the filler hef is inserted into Spec-FinP to eliminate the EPP feature of FinP, which will produce sentences like (29a), known as the Transitive Expletive Construction; see Sigurðsson (1989), Vikner (1995), and Bobaljik and Jonas (1996). The corresponding Swedish sentence is ungrammatical, due to the impossibility of eliminating the nominative feature uFin in the "real" subject:

(29) a. Hef einhver étíð hákarlinn. (Icelandic)
   b. Det har någon ätit hajen. (Swedish)

3.4.4 Stylistic Fronting

The raising of the adverbial i gær ‘yesterday’ to Spec-FinP in (28b) is available in Icelandic but not in Swedish, as should be obvious from the previous discussion: the EPP feature of FinP must be checked by a subject in Spec-FinP in Swedish, otherwise the feature uFin will remain, ruling out the derivation. This restriction is not found in Icelandic, where uFin is part of the person agreement of the finite verb and hence is deleted when the verb raises to FinP. Since the EPP is satisfied by any phonological material in Spec-FinP, only independent principles like Shortest Move will determine which element is fronted in Icelandic. See Holmberg (2000) for a discussion of these matters. In the general case, the element closest to Spec-FinP must be selected; thus when the subject is available, it is the subject that is raised. In such cases the Icelandic example is identical to the Swedish one. When the subject for some reason is not present, or remains in some lower position of the clause, however, an adverbial, the object, the predicative, or the nonfinite verb is raised to Spec-FinP. This fronting, which is easier to detect in embedded clauses, is known as Stylistic Fronting; see Holmberg (2000) for references, and consider the alternative account in Sigurðsson (2001). Some ex-
amples, from Jónsson (1991) and Holmberg (2000), are presented in (30), where the stylistically fronted element is underlined:

(30)  a. Þetta er tilboð sem ekkir er høgt að hafna.
this is offer that not is possible to reject
b. þeir sem þessu erflur afkvöðun verða að taka.
those that this difficult decision have to take
c. Hver heldur þu að stóla hafi hjólmur?
who think you that stolen has the-bike

3.4.5 Oblique Subjects

The presence of ufin in the person inflection of the finite verb is also a necessary prerequisite for oblique subjects in Icelandic, and the absence of ufin in the person inflection of the finite verb is one reason that Mainland Scandinavian does not have oblique subjects. The other reason is the absence of an active morphological case system. The possibility to use DPs in dative, genitive, and accusative as subjects in modern Icelandic has been noticed by many scholars. These oblique DPs share most subject properties with nominative DPs; the only subject property they lack, besides nominative case, is the possibility to agree with the tensed verb. See Sigurðsson (1989) for an overview of the relevant properties and Sigurðsson (2001) for a recent account. One of these properties, the placement after the finite verb when the subject is not sentence initial, is illustrated in the following sentences, taken from Sigurðsson (1989); in these examples, the oblique subject is underlined:

(31)  a. Hafði þér þvi leiðt Haraldur.
had me DAT thus bored Harold,NOM
b. Vantaði þig vinnumu?
lacked you ACC job ACC
c. Götti verðjanna mjög lengi?
noticed pains-the.GEN very long
   'Were the pains noticeable very long?'

The subject properties found with Oblique subjects can all be derived from their position in Spec-FinP. According to the previous discussion, these DPs are not raised to Spec-FinP to check any feature of their own: the ufin feature is part of the verb inflection and is checked in Fin⁵ when the verb raises to this position, and we take for granted that the morphological case is checked by the main verb, if checking is necessary in such cases. The mechanism that forces the oblique subject to go to Spec-FinP is the EPP feature of FinP, in combination with the fact that the oblique subject is the highest argument of VP and thus available for raising to FinP without violating Shortest Move. (For some tricky cases where a violation of Shortest Move seems to be involved, see Platzack (1999)).

3.4.6 Embedded Subject Questions

Consider next the following difference between Swedish and Icelandic:

(32)  a. Hon frågade vad *(som) låg i byrån. (Swedish)
   b. Hún spurrí hvað *(sem) legi í skóflunni. (Icelandic)
   she asked what that was-lying in chest-the

Swedish must have the complementizer som after the wh-word in embedded subject questions, whereas sem is not allowed in Icelandic. As a complementizer, som meets the requirement that Fin should be filled. The difference between Swedish and Icelandic follows from the previously stated assumptions about the left periphery. In both Swedish and Icelandic, wh-words must raise to Spec-FoCp. Since it is the subject that is raised in (32), we take it for granted that the wh-word checks the EPP-feature in Spec-FinP in both languages. Being the subject, the Swedish wh-word also carries the ufin-feature that is checked in Spec-FinP. In Icelandic, where ufin is in the person inflection of the finite verb, no complementizer is allowed in Fin⁴, since that would prevent raising of the finite verb to Fin⁵, as is necessary to eliminate ufin. Norwegian is like Swedish in this respect. The counterpart to som in Danish embedded subject questions is der, which arguably is not a complementizer but the expletive subject der (see Taraldsen 1991, Vikner 1999, Holmberg 2000). In terms of the present analysis, der would, in that case, be merged in Spec-FinP, checking ufin.

3.4.7 Embedded Word Order

In embedded clauses, the relative order of the finite verb and sentence adverbials is different in Mainland Scandinavian and Icelandic: whereas the verb follows the adverbial(s) in Mainland Scandinavian, it precedes the adverbial(s) in Icelandic; in these examples the adverbial is underlined, and the finite verb is in italics:

(33)  a. Jag vet att Maria inte lätte boken. (Swedish)
   I know that Mary not read book-the
b. Ëg veit að Maria las ekki bókina. (Icelandic)
   I know that Mary read not book-the
The word-order difference in (33) follows immediately from our account: the Swedish complementizer att 'that' is merged in Fin', giving this head phonological content, and the subject Maria is raised to Spec-FinP to eliminate EPP and uFin. Subsequently, the complementizer is raised to Force* to indicate that we have an embedded declarative. The finite verb is stuck in T*, below the negation and other sentence adverbials.

It should be evident by now that a derivation similar to the one just outlined for Swedish would be impossible in Icelandic, with the complementizer að inserted in Fin', the requirement that Fin' must be filled is met, but the uninterpretable uFin of person agreement would not be eliminated. The only available way for Icelandic to resolve the situation is to raise the finite verb to Fin', which erases uFin and makes Fin' visible, and later on insert að in Force*. This will assure that the finite verb precedes the negation and other sentence adverbials in the middle field. The fact that the Mainland Scandinavian complementizer att may be omitted or deleted under certain conditions (just like that in English), while the Icelandic að may not be, may be construed as support for the assumption that the complementizers are merged in different positions.14

In Faroese, there is dialectal variation regarding the position of the finite verb. We return briefly to Faroese in a separate section. It should be noted that the order finite verb > adverbial is not obligatory in all embedded clauses in Icelandic, either: in relative clauses and adverbial clauses, it is optional; see Sigurðsson (1989) and note 9.

4 NP-Structure

As we have tried to show, in the case of sentential syntax and VP-syntax, the variation among the Scandinavian languages mainly follows the division between Mainland and Insular Scandinavian. There is variation within Mainland Scandinavian, but it is relatively minor. In the case of noun phrase internal syntax, the variation does not follow the Mainland-Insular division. There is as much variation between, say, Bokmål Norwegian and Standard Swedish as there is between Bokmål and Icelandic. On the whole, there is a striking amount of variation regarding noun phrase internal syntax among the Scandinavian languages. Not only do the standard languages each have their own distinct ways of combining articles, adjectives, demonstratives, quantifiers, possessives, and head nouns but almost every local dialect appears to have its own NP-syntax. To take an example,

there are at least seven distinct ways of saying 'John's book' in Scandinavian, with additional minor variations, such as the choice of preposition in (34g), or dative instead of genitive case on the possessor:

(34) a. Jons bok
    Jon’s book
b. bok Jons
    book Jon’s
c. Jons boken
    Jon’s book-the
d. boken Jons
    book-the Jon’s
e. boken hans Jon(s)
    book-the his Jon(s)
f. Jon sin bok
    Jon his.REFL book
g. boken til Jon
    book-the to Jon

See Taraldsen (1990), Delsing (1993), and Holmberg and Sandström (1996a). We do not discuss possessive constructions here, though, but present some views on another controversial topic in Scandinavian NP-syntax—namely, the interplay of attributive adjectives and definiteness marking.

In simple NPs, definiteness is expressed by a suffix on the head noun in all the Scandinavian languages:

(35) a. bok-in (Icelandic)
    b. bok-a (Norwegian)
c. bog-en (Danish)
    'the book'

The definite suffix is inflected for gender, number, and (in Insular Scandinavian) case. Historically, the definite suffix is assumed to be derived from a postnominal demonstrative him 'this', and this hypothesis is supported by the observation that the inflectional paradigm of the Old Norse demonstrative him is exactly the same
as the paradigm of the suffixed article. Singular indefiniteness is expressed by a free, prenominal indefinite article (inflected for gender) in Mainland Scandinavian and Faroese, and by the absence of an article in Icelandic and Old Scandinavian. There is no indefinite article in plural:

(36) a. bók (Icelandic)
    b. en bok (Swedish)
        'a book'

(37) a. bokkur (Icelandic)
    b. böcker (Swedish)
        'books'

A straightforward analysis of the suffixed definite article—henceforth abbreviated Dx—is that it is a form of D, merged with NP and forming a regular head-initial [D NP], but triggering noun movement, so that it ends up as a suffix on the noun.16 Some initial support for the movement hypothesis is provided by the possessive construction (38a), characteristic of Icelandic, Norwegian, and Northern Swedish. The counterpart in Danish and Standard and Southern Swedish is (38b):

(38) a. bókin mín (Icelandic)
    book-the my
    b. min bog (Danish)
        my book

The contrast can be described as a difference in the features of the possessive pronoun, as follows: In all the languages, the possessive pronoun is merged in prenominal position. In Icelandic, Norwegian, and Northern Swedish, the possessive pronoun does not itself encode definiteness and therefore allows merge of the definite article, which triggers noun movement. In Danish, Standard, and Southern Swedish, the possessive pronoun itself encodes definiteness and therefore precludes merge of an article.16 Attributive adjectives pose a serious complication: In indefinite NPs the adjectives are prenominal:

(39) en ny bil
    a new car

In view of (38a), one might expect at least some of the Scandinavian languages to have postnominal attributive adjectives in construction with the definite suffix. This does not occur, however. Instead, we find the following pattern:

(40) a. nýja bilinn (Icelandic)
    b. den nya bilen (Norwegian, Swedish, Faroese)
    c. den nye bil (Danish)
    d. nybilen (Northern Swedish)
        'the new car'

In Icelandic definite noun phrases, the adjective precedes noun+suffix. In Norwegian, Standard Swedish, and Faroese, the adjective precedes noun+suffix, but, in addition, they have a free definite article preceding the adjective. Danish has a free definite article preceding the adjective and the suffixless noun. Yet another variant is exhibited by Northern Swedish: the adjective is incorporated in the definite form of the noun.

In most recent works on the Scandinavian NP, the Mainland Scandinavian free definite article is seen as a kind of expletive: the adjective blocks movement of the noun to D, triggering insertion of the free article to "license D" in some sense (see Santelmann 1993; see Kester 1996 for a review of the literature). The fact that Icelandic doesn’t need the free article would be an effect of the richer morphology of Icelandic (see Vangnæs 1999). This is relatively straightforward in the case of Danish but less so in Faroese, Norwegian, and most varieties of Swedish, where a free and a suffixed article are both required, in construction with attributive adjectives. The double definiteness marking exhibited by this construction is a classical problem in Scandinavian grammar. The question is: Which of the two articles is the interpretable one, encoding definiteness, and which is expletive? Or are they both interpretable but fulfilling different, complementary functions in relation to definiteness, specificity, familiarity; or some such notions?

Within traditional Swedish and Norwegian grammar—for instance, Lundebäck (1965)—the free article is sometimes called "the article of the adjective," implying that its function is specifically to license the adjective. Kester (1996) presents a modern version of this idea: Following Higginbotham (1985), she assumes that both the adjective and the noun are predicates that have a 0-role that needs to be discharged. The 0-role is formally an open position in the lexical head. In DPs, unlike VPs, this 0-role is generally not discharged by 0-role assignment but by virtue of being bound by a determiner, so called 0-binding. If and only if every predicate is 0-bound by a determiner, the noun phrase is saturated, and only then can the noun phrase function as an argument. The reason
(41) is ungrammatical in Swedish, Norwegian, and Faroese, as, according to Kester, that the adjective is not 0-bound, and the noun phrase therefore is not saturated:

(41) *nya bilen
    new car-the

The suffixed article can θ-bind the noun, but not the adjective. Following Cinque (1994), Kester assumes that attributive adjectives are merged as specifiers of functional heads encoding properties like "size," "age," and "material." We can label these heads 'α'. She also assumes that the suffixed article is a head, called F, situated between D and NP, which attracts the noun out of NP (see also Giusti 1997 and Vangnes 1999). The structure of (41) is therefore (42), where the adjective is outside the scope of the definite article:

(42) [F [α n] [α, a [F bil + en [F f]]]]

According to Kester, F encodes "familiarity," while D encodes "specificity." See Vangnes (1999) for a more fine-grained analysis of the semantics of nominal heads.

The adjectival head a is also not capable of binding the predicate variable of its specifier adjective. Therefore, a free definite article must be merged. As for Danish, which has no Dα, but only a free article in construction with attributive adjectives, either it has no F, or F has no morphological realization.

As shown, Icelandic doesn’t need a free determiner. Old Scandinavian, too, managed without a free determiner. Plausibly this is linked to some other property that Icelandic and Old Scandinavian have but the other Scandinavian languages do not have. An idea articulated by Holmberg (1994), Holmberg and Sandström (1996a), and Kester (1996) is that the crucial property is morphological Case. In Higginbotham’s (1987) terms, morphological Case would be able to θ-bind the adjective, perhaps by virtue of being represented as an abstract head K, commanding aP-NP:

(43) [K [α nyja [α, a [P bilan]]]]

An alternative is that morphological Case provides the additional feature needed for the adjectival head a to θ-bind the adjective in its specifier.15 Vangnes (1999) argues that the crucial property is gender morphology; in Icelandic and Old Scandinavian, but not in modern Mainland Scandinavian, the attributive adjective is marked for gender.

We still need an explanation why D must be a free article in Mainland Scandinavian and Faroese. In other words, why can’t D be a suffixed article attracting the noun (or NP) to yield bilen nja from [P -en [nja ([P] [bil]]), neither in Danish nor in the other languages?20 As mentioned, the received view is that the adjective blocks noun movement. In fact, given an appropriate version of Cinque’s (1994) theory, the adjective itself will not block noun movement, but the head a will, by virtue of the Head Movement Constraint (HMC), unless a itself can attract the noun, and then D can attract a with an adjoined noun. So, assuming that Scandinavian a does not attract the noun, noun movement to D across an adjective is impossible. Within this theory the adjective itself, a specifier of a, will block NP-movement to Spec-DP by virtue of some version of Shortest Move or the Minimal Link Condition. Hence the order bilen nja cannot be derived by NP-movement, either.

An attractive consequence of this theory (not mentioned by Kester, 1996) is that it explains straightforwardly why the free article is not needed in Faroese and Swedish in those cases where the adjective-noun combination is a name, as in Våta Huset ‘the White House’, and Døde Havet ‘the Dead Sea’: see Delsing (1993: 115f) and Lockwood (1977). The adjectives in these expressions are not descriptives, but part of a name. Formally, they do not have a θ-role to discharge (in Higginbotham’s 1987 terms) and therefore do not need a c-commanding determiner. In Faroese and Swedish, the free determiner is, in fact, frequently left out as soon as a convention has been established between a set of interlocutors to use an adjective-noun combination to refer to a specific object. The determinerless form nja bilen can be used when, say, the interlocutors have two cars at their disposal, in which case a convention can be established, more or less ad hoc, to refer to them as nja bilen ‘the new car’ and gamla bilen ‘the old car’, respectively. In this case, too, the adjective is not descriptive, but “identifying,” in the manner of a proper name. That is, it doesn’t have a θ-role to discharge and therefore doesn’t need a free determiner.21

The theory also offers an interesting outlook on the incorporated adjectives in Northern Swedish. First, the incorporated adjectives are, or can be, truly descriptive. They can also be stacked:

(44) Ser du storstvartbilnen jämna?
    see you big-black-car-the there
    ‘Do you see that big, black, car?’

Second, the incorporation takes place only in constructions with the definite form of the noun. Indefinite noun phrases generally have the form (45b) in NSw dialects; the standard form is (45c); and no dialect has the form (45a):

(45) a. *en storsvartbil
b. en stor en svart en bil
c. en stor svart bil
'a big black car'

Plausibly the incorporation is a way of bringing the adjective within the scope of the definite suffix, so that the definite suffix can θ-bind the adjective, as well as the noun, in which case the free determiner is redundant. In the indefinite noun phrase, the article is, and always has been, a free article, which c-commands, and thereby takes scope over the adjective(s) and the noun with no need for movement or incorporation. In definite noun phrases, the article is a suffix attracting a noun or NP, which calls for something special to ensure θ-binding of the adjective.

In terms of language change, the form [Adj N-Dx] was licit as long as there was Case morphology (or adjectival gender morphology, according to Vangnæs 1999). When the Case morphology (or gender morphology) disappeared, perhaps for independent phonological reasons, basically two strategies emerged to compensate for the loss and to ensure θ-binding of the adjective: one was to bring the adjective within the scope of the suffixed article by a form of incorporation or compounding (Northern Swedish); the other was to introduce a free definite article (other Mainland Scandinavian languages and Faroese).21

How is the Northern Swedish A+N compound derived? Sandström and Holmberg (1994) have a proposal: they assume that N+Dx is derived by N-movement to D. In Northern Swedish the movement applies across the adjective, analyzed as a head taking NP as complement (following Abney 1987), as in (45a):

\[(46)\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & [\text{n}][\text{bil-en}] [\text{ny } [\text{t}]] \\
& \text{car-the } \text{new}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & [\text{n}][\text{ny-bil-en}] [\text{t } [\text{t}]] \\
& \text{new-car-the}
\end{align*}
\]

This movement violates the HMC, but the HMC violation is then repaired by movement and incorporation of the adjective into the N+D head, as in (46b), given that the derived head *nybilen* can have only one index, so that the resulting head chain is (*nybilen, t, t*).

This presupposes a representational view of conditions on movement: A movement may violate a condition—for example, the HMC—if the violation can be repaired by subsequent operations, so that the end result respects all the relevant constraints.

An alternative is that N+Dx is derived by XP-movement to Spec-DP. In the case of adjective incorporation, the phrase that moves is αp', made up of a series of adjectives and a noun. In PF, the A+(A)+N+D sequence is spelled out as a word. It follows that the order of adjectives is the same in the synthetic definite DPs as in analytic DPs: namely, the order discussed by Cinque (1994). This was a complication in the theory of Sandström and Holmberg (1994):

\[(47)\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{en stor svart bil} \\
& \text{a black big car}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{storvaribili en svart stor bil} \\
& \text{big-black-car-the black-big-car-the}
\end{align*}
\]

Still, the fact that Northern Swedish DPs do not make use of a free determiner or any additional inflectional morphology indicates that the adjective incorporation is not just a matter of phonology but is syntactic, with effects at LF as well as at PF: the adjective(s), the noun, and the article undergo a syntactic operation, as a result of which the suffixed definite article θ-binds both the adjective and the noun at LF and is spelled out as a form of compound at PF. We leave the precise nature of this operation for future research.22

As an additional comment on θ-binding, we notice that an expression such as the new car denotes a single object which is new and is a car. This is ensured if the adjective and the noun have the same θ-binder. This, in turn, suggests that only one of the articles in the Faroese-Norwegian-Swedish double definiteness DPs is a θ-binder. Given the assumptions made here, following Kester (1996) and Cinque (1994), this should be the free determiner. In that case, what is Ds doing there? Either it is just agreement morphology—in other words, it encodes only uninterpretable features (see Giusti 1997 for an elaboration of this hypothesis)—or it encodes some other feature(s), not related to θ-binding.

Support for the contention that the free article alone is the θ-binder, and hence the one that determines the reference of the noun phrase, is provided by the following observation (due to Tarald Taraldsen, pers. comm.). There is a clear contrast between (48a, b): (48a) necessarily denotes only one person, while (48b) preferably denotes two:

\[(48)\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{den unge professorn och nyblivne fadern} \\
& \text{the young professor-the and recent father-the}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{den unge professorn och den nyblivne fadern} \\
& \text{the young professor-the and the recent father-the}
\end{align*}
\]

This follows if the free article alone is the θ-binder. In (48a) there is but one free article; in (48b) there are two. The number of suffixed articles makes no difference.

In contrast, there is conflicting evidence that Ds is interpretable while the free article is, or at least can be, expletive, as discussed by Delsing (1993: 128–139) and Kester (1996: 141ff.). The following example is Delsing's:
In this context, an argument is normally subject to the definiteness effect. The free article is possible in this context, but $Dx$ is not. This effect is seen typically in construction with superlative adjectives. Whatever the explanation, the observation militates against the hypothesis that $Dx$ is expletive.

5 A Note on Faroese

The Faroe islands are geographically about halfway between Mainland Scandinavia and Iceland. The grammar of Faroese is also in many respects halfway between Mainland Scandinavian and Icelandic.

In terms of inflectional morphology, Faroese is "more Insular than Mainland," as it has both Case and subject-verb agreement morphology. The Case and agreement paradigms are simpler, though, than the Icelandic and Old Scandinavian counterparts. As for Case, the genitive has ceased to be "completely active" in modern spoken Faroese, according to Petersen et al. (1998). As for subject-verb agreement, the most striking difference between Faroese and Icelandic/Old Scandinavian is that there is no person distinction in the plural of finite verbs; see Petersen et al. (1998) and Rohrbacher (1994).

As for the phenomena discussed in sections 3.3 (the middle field) and 3.4 (the left periphery), the broad tendency is that the structures and operations that are obligatory in Icelandic and nonexistent in Mainland Scandinavian are optional or subject to dialectal variation in Faroese. For instance, with regard to the position of the finite verb in relation to the negation and other adverbs in embedded clauses, the most commonly occurring order is Adv–Vfin, as in Mainland Scandinavian, but the Insular Scandinavian order Vfin–Adv occurs as well. According to Petersen et al. (1998), there is considerable variation in the use of Vfin–Adv order in written Faroese, and speakers vary in their acceptance of this order; see Jonas (1996: ch. 4). Recently, Petersen (2000) has shown that Faroese speakers around the age of 20 tend to use only the Adv–Vfin order.

As shown in section 3.4.2, in Icelandic the expletive always precedes the finite verb, while in Mainland Scandinavian it may precede or follow the finite verb; see (37, 28). In Faroese the expletive may optionally follow the finite verb (examples from Petersen et al. 1998):

a. Tað eru mys í baðikaralum.
there are mice in bathtub-the

b. Eru (tað) mys í baðikaralum?

(c. Tað regnar ofta í Havn.
it rains often in Torshavn

(d. Í Havn regnar (tað) ofta.

We proposed that the crucial difference between Insular and Mainland Scandinavian is that the Insular Scandinavian person agreement feature in $T$ has a uFin feature. This triggers movement of $T$ to Fin in all finite clauses in Insular Scandinavian and eliminates the need for an expletive, except to check the EPP-feature of Fin. The Faroese facts follow if Faroese person agreement has a uFin feature optionally. When it has the feature, $T$ must move to Fin, together with the verb, in which case there is no need for an expletive, except to check the EPP-feature of Fin.

As we might expect, Faroese has transitive expletives (at least some speakers do; see Jonas 1996), oblique subjects, and Stylistic Fronting—all properties of a language with uFin in $T$. It also has deletion of the complementizer at 'that', which we suggested is a characteristic of languages without uFin in $T$; see Petersen et al. (1998: 216f.). As predicted, the complementizer 'at' 'that', the Faroese counterpart to Swedish and Norwegian som, is optional in embedded subject questions (see Petersen et al. 1998: 221); compare section 3.4.6.

What has been said here predicts certain correlations of properties in Faroese. For instance, insular as an oblique subject presupposes person agreement with uFin, and consequently obligatory movement of $T$ to Fin, the prediction is that oblique subjects should not be allowed in embedded clauses where the finite verb follows the negation, indicating that $T$ has not moved to Fin. This prediction is false (Johan i Lon Jakobsen, pers. comm.). Since we have to allow for a certain amount of "peripheral grammar," with fixed expressions, archaic forms, semi-productive rules, and the like, the following is a more interesting formulation of the prediction: a number of verbs in Faroese take either an oblique or a nominative subject—the former typically in written and the latter in spoken language. Petersen et al. mention dana 'like', leingaist 'long, years', mangla 'need', and a few more. The following is one of their examples:

51 Honum/fann leingist aðla heimafrur.
he-DAT/he-NOM longs always back home
'He is always homesick.'
The prediction is that there should be a preference for using the nominative when T manifestly has not moved to FIn, that is in embedded clauses with Adv–VFin order. The prediction is hard to test given the stylistic differences between the two alternatives, but presumably it is not impossible.23

6 Historical Notes

In the preceding sections, we have occasionally mentioned that the syntax of the Middle Ages versions of Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish has a lot in common with the syntax of modern Icelandic. There are many morphological similarities as well; thus, for example, modern Icelandic, as well as Middle Ages Mainland Scandinavian, has morphological case, subjunctive forms of the verb, and subject–verb agreement in person and number; these inflections have disappeared in modern Mainland Scandinavian. Generally speaking, the change from an Icelandic type of grammar to a Mainland Scandinavian type of grammar seems to coincide with the loss of person inflection on the tensed verb; see Falk (1993) for a thorough demonstration of this correlation for Swedish, where the loss of agreement took place during the sixteenth century. See also Holmberg and Plattrak (1995: 121–123). We will here exemplify some of the Icelandic type of properties of Old Swedish prior to the loss of person agreement.

Like modern Icelandic, Old Swedish has the finite verb in front of sentence adverbials in embedded clauses, as shown in (52); compare section 3.4.7:

(52) hva kristne män riddos el pino (1385)
why Christian men feared not pain

Stylistic fronting—that is, the satisfying of EPP in Spec–FinP by the raising of the closest phonological realized element in cases where the subject is not clause initial (see section 3.4.4)—is also found in Old Swedish:

(53) ok vppinarad hwt hanum hafðhe hant (1375)
and revealed what him had happened

Old Swedish has Oblique subjects, like modern Icelandic (see section 3.4.5):

(54) tha hungradhe varom herra (end of 14th century)
then starved our lord (dative)

In Old Swedish it is not necessary to express the subject overtly. Thus, as in modern Icelandic, an expletive subject is not obligatory (see section 3.4.2):

(55) är grauit vndir syl (13th century)
is dug under sill

This list can be enlarged. However, there are also some diachronic changes at the sentence level that are not related to the loss of person agreement and do not lead to a syntactic difference between Insular and Mainland Scandinavian. A case at hand is the concurrent occurrence of both finite verb > object > nonfinite verb and finite verb > nonfinite verb > object, in all the medieval variants of the Scandinavian languages; this has been observed at least since Wenning (1930) and Larsson (1931), and it has been discussed recently for Old Icelandic by Sigurðsson (1988), Rögnvaldssøn (1996), and Hróarsdóttir (1996, 1998, 2000) and for Old Swedish by Delsing (1999, 2001). See also Plattrak (1991) for a similar situation in Old English. As Hróarsdóttir has shown, this variation disappears in Icelandic during the nineteenth century, whereas it is lost in Mainland Scandinavian already at the end of the Middle Ages.

The following examples illustrate the variation at hand; the Old Icelandic sentences are from Sigurðsson (1988), the Old Swedish ones from Delsing (1999):

(56) a. Mótið mín skal því ráða. (Old Icelandic: OV)
mother my shall that decide
‘My mother will decide.’

b. Skalt þú jafnan þessu seiti halda. (Old Icelandic: OV)
shall you always this seat keep
‘You will always keep this seat.’

c. þa let herodes taka ioan. (Old Icelandic: VO)
then let Herodes take John
‘Then Herodes took John prisoner.’

d. hvárt hon vill eiga hann. (Old Icelandic: VO)
whether she wants to own him
‘if she wants to own him’

(57) a. at han skulde ekke seger fa (Old Swedish: OV)
that he should not victory get
‘that he won’t get a victory’
b. at hon aldrig skulde thz nakrom sighia (Old Swedish: OV) that she never should it someone-DAT say 'that she would never tell it to somebody'

c. ok scende mik at lasa thin band (Old Swedish: VO) and sent me to open your fettars 'and sent me to open your fettars'

d. eller han wildi radhe hønni ok oei droeps hance (Old Swedish: VO) or he wanted to advise her and not kill her 'and he wanted to give her advice and didn't want to kill her'

Delsing (1999, 2001) has made the interesting observation that only a subset of all objects may occur in preverbal position. Objects containing proper names, definite or indefinite articles, genitive attributes, and cardinal numerals almost always occur after the nonfinite verb, whereas objects containing demonstrative pronouns, possessive pronouns, and indefinite pronouns may be placed either in front of or after the nonfinite verb. Although his study is not as detailed as Delsing's, the data in Ñøgveldsson (1996) indicate that the same situation probably existed in Old Icelandic. Observing that the two types of objects may be analyzed in terms of filled or activated D, Delsing (1999, 2001) suggests that objects with filled/activated D are licensed in postverbal position, whereas objects where D is not filled or activated have to move to preverbal position to be licensed.

The loss of OV in Icelandic is the subject of a paper by Hróarsdóttir (1996), and see also Hróarsdóttir (1998); the main results are that in the course of approximately 60 years around the year 1800, the frequency of OV order dropped rapidly.

7 Summary and Conclusion

In this chapter we have given an overview of the syntax of the modern Scandinavian languages—that is, Danish, Faroese, Icelandic, Norwegian, and Swedish; we have also added some remarks on earlier stages of these languages. Generally speaking, the Mainland Scandinavian languages have almost identical syntactic properties on the sentential level and differ in some respects profoundly from Icelandic, where person agreement on the finite verb and case marking on nouns trigger verb movement and make available syntactic properties like stylistic fronting, transitive expletive constructions, and oblique subjects not available to present-day Mainland Scandinavian. Faroese seems to be in the process of changing from a syntax closely related to the Icelandic one to a Mainland Scandinavian syntax.

As we have mentioned, noun phrase syntax does not group the Scandinavian languages in the same way as sentential syntax: with respect to the internal syntax of the noun phrase, the Scandinavian languages display great variation, especially if dialectal variants are considered.

NOTES

1. Besides being the national language of Sweden, Swedish is also an official language of Finland, together with Finnish (a Uralic language, not included among the Scandinavian languages). There are two Norwegian variants with official status as national languages: Bokmål and Nynorsk. Syntactically, these languages are almost identical (cf. Faarlund et al. 1997: 23), and we will therefore usually subsume them under the label "Norwegian."

2. This example is included to show that verb-second pertains to the tensed (finite) verb, irrespective of its status as main verb or auxiliary. Another property, common to all the Scandinavian languages, that is illustrated by this example is that the auxiliaries, both finite and nonfinite ones, precede the main verb. This holds true for main clauses as well as for embedded clauses:

(i) Han undrade om jag faktiskt kunde ha bidragit pengarna under sängen.
   he wondered if i actually might have found money-the under bed-the

3. Negated objects are exceptional in this respect, since they occur before the nonfinite verb, in the position of the negation, with some cross-Scandinavian variation. See Koch-Christensen (1986) and Kayne (1998) for a recent discussion. The object is underlined in the following Swedish examples:

   (i) a. Han hade inte köpt något.
       he had not bought anything
        b. Han hade ingen köpt.
           he had nothing bought

   (ii) a. Han hade inte träffat någon.
        he had not met anyone
        b. *Han hade ingen träffat.
           he had none met

The Norwegian counterpart to (ii) is well-formed.

4. Note that the Icelandic counterpart to (ii) is well-formed. An indefinite object may not precede the adverbial:

   (i) *Hann leypti bekki ekki.
       he bought books not
claratives, which apparently are introduced by the finite verb. This is often found in
oral tellings and is known as Narrative inversion; a Swedish example is given in (3),

(i) Så låg han bara där. Kommer hon in där, kände han igen henne, började han
darra.
so lay he just there comes she in there recognized he her began he tremble

14. See Branigan (1996) for a theory that is close to the one presented here. See
Koeneman (2001) for another recent account of verb placement in Scandinavian.
15. Another possibility is that the order N-Dx is the result of NP-movement to
Spec-DP. The word order of (i) is a complication for the NP-movement hypothesis:

(i) bilden av kungen
picture-the of king-the
‘the picture of the king’

It can still be derived on the assumption that av kungen, the complement of N, first
moves to a position between D and N (assuming that all phrases are underlingly head-
initial and that all movement is leftward), before the remnant NP moves to Spec-DP.
Later we suggest that there is at least one case where N-Dx order is derived by NP-
movement.

16. See Taraldsen (1990), Delsing (1993), Holmberg and Sandström (1996a), and
Vangnæs (1999). At first, the possessive pronoun looks to be the same in (38a, b), but a
closer look reveals that, while the prenominal pronoun is unrestricted, the postnominal
pronoun is obligatorily weak (in the sense of Cardinaletti and Stavi 1990). For exam-
ple, the prenominal pronoun can be coordinated, the postnominal pronoun cannot:

(i) min og din bok (Norwegian)
my and your book

(ii) *boka min og din
book-the my and your

17. As discussed in Holmberg (1994), at least among the languages in Europe, lan-
guages without articles all have fairly rich Case morphology; conversely, languages with-
out Case morphology all have articles.

18. In Vangnæs’s terms, the gender feature makes the adjective capable of licensing
D (to put it simply), by actually moving covertly to D. It could be mentioned that,
although the Case-morphology of nouns and pronouns is rich enough in Icelandic and
Old Scandinavian, morphological Case-marking on attributive adjectives is minimal, dis-
tinguishing only between nominative and oblique. Faroese is a potential counterexample
to both the Case hypothesis and the gender hypothesis, since Faroese has morphological
Case and has gender marked on attributive adjectives, yet requires a free determiner.
Holmberg (1994), Holmberg and Platzack (1995), and Vangnæs (1999) all point to the
fact that Case, as well as gender marking, is lower in Faroese than in Icelandic or Old
Scandinavian.

19. Kester (1996) has an explanation in terms of checking theory: If the noun
moved to D, it would check and thereby eliminate the feature required to 8-bind the
adjective. However, this presupposes that checking eliminates interpretable features, which is impossible, as discussed in Chomsky (1995: ch. 4).

20. As mentioned, Danish doesn't have Ds in construction with descriptive attributive adjectives and also does not do so in names: Det Hvide Høj 'The White House', Det Døde Hav 'The Dead Sea'. Norwegian, for some reason, either behaves like Danish or employs a form of compounding: Det Hvite Hva but Døde Hvat, the latter with compound intonation. The generalization is that proper names never show double definiteness. The question is why proper names have an article at all, given that there is no need for 8-binding. Possibly it is just a segment of the name with no syntactic function, as in, say, The Hague. Still, there are languages that consistently use articles with proper names, including, in fact, many Scandinavian dialects; see Deling (1995).

21. A factor that we have ignored entirely here is the "weak-strong" or definite-indefinite inflection on adjectives, found in all the Scandinavian languages. This question is, does it realize an uninterpretable feature, or does it play a more active role somehow? It might perhaps be a realization of a, but in the absence of a more thorough investigation, this suggestion may be taken with great care.

22. As discussed by Holmberg and Sandström (1996b), it is characteristic of Northern Swedish that definite noun phrases always exhibit an overt definite article — namely, the definite suffix. This includes possessive constructions. Out of the possessive constructions listed under (34), all and only those that employ D (that is c, d, e, and g) are characteristic of Northern Swedish dialects. It also includes generic noun phrases; compare the following:

(i) Koen le klock. (Northern Swedish)
cows-the are clever

(ii) Kor ar kloka. (Standard Swedish)
cows are clever.

Cows are clever.'

As they note, in this respect Northern Swedish is closer to Romance than to Germanic languages, in terms of the typology of Longobardi (1994).

23. Jonas (1996b) reports some correlations of the expected kind. In particular, among the speakers she consulted, those who accepted transitive expletive were the ones who also accepted the order Vfin–Adv in norbridge-embedded clauses.
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CHAPTER 11

NOUN CLASS, GENDER, AND THE LEXICON-SYNTAX-MORPHOLOGY INTERFACES

A Comparative Study of Niger-Congo and Romance Languages

ALAIN KIHM

1 INTRODUCTION

Not all grammatical categories are created equal, as far as universality is concerned. For instance, Number—that is, the formal indication of whether one or more than one token of a given entity concept is being referred to—is an excellent candidate for universality, inasmuch as no natural language seems to be devoid of the category, even though there is variation as to its applicability (on this, see Chierchia 1998). Gender, on the other hand, appears a poor candidate. Consider a rudimentary gender system like that of English: noun phrases denoting interestingly sexed organisms (i.e., human beings and pets) are masculine or feminine;