

(Work in progress)

eva.engels@hum.au.dk

(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

(2) 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

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

In fact, the construction in (3) is ungrammatical in the other Scandinavian languages, too.

- (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

However, the sentence in (4) and (5) are ruled out for independent reasons. In Icelandic, an overt expletive cannot appear in subject position, (6). Occurrence of an associate subject to the left of a non-finite verb is possible, (7).

- (6) 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

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

In Mainland Scandinavian, in contrast, the presence of an overt expletive is obligatory, (8), but an associate subject cannot occur in clause-medial position, (9).

- (8) 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

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

Section 2.1 argues that there are two subject positions in the IP domain, SpecAgrSP for the expletive and SpecTP for the associate subject (only available in some languages). As section 2.2 shows, simultaneous filling of these positions is not excluded as such: It is

2 Restrictions on the co-occurrence restriction

Occurrence of an overt expletive is possible in Icelandic embedded questions while topicalization is not (independent of whether or not the expletive is present), indicating that the overt expletive occupies a specifier position in IP.

- Moreover, an associate subject to the left of a non-finite verb would seem to appear in IP. It precedes all non-finite auxiliaries, (11), as well as an object that has moved out of VP by Object Shift, (12) (cf. Bobaljik & Jonas 1996; see Holmberg 1986, 1999, and Engels & Vikner 2007 on Object Shift).

- (11) a. Það mun hafa verið **gód mynd** í sjónvarpinu. *Ic*
 b. *Það mun hafa **gód mynd** verið í sjónvarpinu.
 c. Það mun **gód mynd** hafa verið í sjónvarpinu.
there must (good film) have (good film) been (good film) on TV

(adapted from Vikner 1995: 212)

- (12) ?Það drekka sennilega **sumir krakkar** hana aldrei. *Ic*
there drink probably some kids it never (Vangsnes 2002: 45)

Thus, given that the expletive in (11) and (12) is inserted in IP, from where it undergoes movement to SpecCP, there must be two subject positions in the IP domain, SpecAgrSP for the expletive and SpecTP for the associate subject. The availability of SpecTP is 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; cf. (2), (7) and (9) above. 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, (13), and Faroese I, (14), but ungrammatical in Mainland Scandinavian, (15).

- (13) Það byggðu **margir Íslendingar** hús í Þórshöfn. *Ic*
there built many Icelanders house in Tórshavn (Jonas 1996b: 168)

- (14) Tað bygdu **nakrir Íslendingar** hús í Havn. *Fa I*
there built some Icelanders house in Tórshavn (Jonas 1994: 50)

- (15) *Der byggede **nogle islændinge** hus i Tórshavn. *Da*
there built some Icelanders house in Torshavn

This correlation is accounted for by the assumption that the associate subject of a TEC cannot remain in its VP-internal position (SpecvP) but needs to be licensed in SpecTP, as illustrated in (16). The associate subject of an existential construction, in contrast, can be licensed in its base position (as complement of V°) or move to SpecTP if this position is available in the given language. (Unavailable positions are marked by shading in (16).)

(16)		CP – AgrSP	SpecTP	SpecvP	V°	Comp	Adv	ex.
Ic/Fa I	exist	a	<u>expl</u> aux		v	sub	adv	(2)a/(7)a
		b	<u>expl</u> aux	sub	v	t _{sub}	adv	(2)b/(7)b
	TEC	c *	<u>expl</u> v	sub	t _v	obj		-
		d	<u>expl</u> v	sub	t _{sub}	obj		(13)/(14)
MSc	exist	e	<u>expl</u> aux		v	sub	adv	(9)a
		f *	<u>expl</u> aux	sub	v	t _{sub}	adv	(9)b
	TEC	g *	<u>expl</u> v	sub	t _v	obj		(15)
		h *	<u>expl</u> v	sub	t _{sub}	obj		(15)

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 (e.g. Bobaljik & Thráinsson 1998 and Koenenman & Neeleman 2001) or to differences in checking requirements (e.g. Bobaljik & Jonas 1996 and Vangsnes 2002). 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; cf. 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; cf. Vikner 1990, 1995, Sigurðsson 1991, Bobaljik & Thráinsson 1998 and Koenenman & Neeleman 2001). For reasons of space, I cannot go into these issues here.

2.2 Adjacency

Given that there are two subject positions in the IP domain in Faroese I, as argued for in the previous section, the ungrammaticality of the clause-medial sequence *expletive < associate subject* in (17) (repeated from (3) above) and (18) cannot be due to the fact that overt expletive and associate subject compete for the same position.

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

- (18) *Allarhelst hefur tað **onkur** keypt húsíð hjá Róa. *Fa I*
probably has there somebody bought house-the of Roa

In fact, an overt expletive in SpecAgrSP may co-occur with an associate subject in SpecTP in embedded clauses, (19).^{3,4} (Recall that the expletive must be located in SpecAgrSP as CP recursion is prohibited in embedded questions; cf. (10) above.)

- (19) a. ?Hon spurdi um tað hǽvdu **nakrir hundar** verið úti í garðinum. *Fa I*
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.)

Note that simultaneous filling of SpecAgrSP and SpecTP is ungrammatical if V^o-to-I^o movement does not take place, (20).⁵

- (20) a. *Hon spurdi um tað **nakrir hundar** hǽvdu verið úti í garðinum. *Fa I*
she asked if there some dogs had been out in garden-the
 b. *Hon spurdi um tað **onkur** hevði keypt húsíð hjá Róa.
she asked if there somebody had bought house-the of Roa

(Zakaris Svabo Hansen, p.c.)

What distinguishes the grammatical sentences in (19) from the ungrammatical ones in (17), (18) and (20) is that the finite verb intervenes between the expletive in SpecAgrSP and the associate subject in SpecTP in the former but precedes/follows both constituents in the latter.⁶ Hence, the occurrence of an associate subject in SpecTP is apparently blocked by an adjacent overt expletive. As shown in the following sections, the sequence *expletive*<*associate subject* is not prohibited as such.

(21)	Fa I		CP - AgrSP	SpecTP		ex.
non-adjacent expletive	a		<u>expl</u> v	sub		(19)
adjacent expletive	b	*	(v) <u>expl</u>	sub	(v)	(17)/(18)/(20)

2.3 Simple/complex tense

Though adjacency would seem to be a necessary condition for ungrammaticality, it is not a sufficient one: The sequence *expletive*<*associate subject* is not excluded as such. Asymmetries between existential constructions and TECs with simple and complex verbs indicate that the co-occurrence restriction only applies to associate subjects in VP-external position.

The sequence *expletive*<*associate subject* is acceptable in existential constructions with simple tense, (22), but not in ones with complex tense, (23).

- (22) 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

- (23) 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 (22), V° -to- I° -to- C° movement obscures the exact structural position of the associate subject: It could be located in SpecTP or in its base position. In contrast, preceding the non-finite verb, the associate subject in (23) must occupy SpecTP. Thus, the contrast suggests that the co-occurrence restriction does not apply to associate subjects in VP-internal position; an associate subject *in situ* is acceptable in the presence of an adjacent overt expletive.

(24)	Fa I: existential		CP-AgrSP	SpecTP	V°	Comp	Adv	ex.
non-adjacent expletive	simple	a	<u>expl</u> v		t_v	sub	adv	(22)a
	tense	b	<u>expl</u> v	sub	t_v	t_{sub}	adv	(22)a
	complex	c	<u>expl</u> aux		v	sub	adv	(2)a
	tense	d	<u>expl</u> aux	sub	v	t_{sub}	adv	(23)a
adjacent expletive	simple	e	v <u>expl</u>		t_v	sub	adv	(22)b ⁷
	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	(23)b

In contrast to existential constructions, TECs, which require licensing of the associate subject in SpecTP (cf. section 2.1), do not permit the sequence *expletive*<*associate subject*, irrespective of simple or complex tense.

- (25) 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

- (26) 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

(27)	Fa I: TEC	CP – AgrSP	SpecTP	SpecvP	V°	Comp	ex.
non-adjacent expletive	simple	a * <u>expl</u> v		sub	t _v	obj	-
	tense	b <u>expl</u> v	sub	t _{sub}	t _v	obj	(25)a
	complex	c * <u>expl</u> aux		sub	v	obj	-
	tense	d <u>expl</u> aux	sub	t _{sub}	v	obj	(26)a
adjacent expletive	simple	e * v <u>expl</u>		sub	t _v	obj	(25)b
	tense	f * v <u>expl</u>	sub	t _{sub}	t _v	obj	(25)b
	complex	g * aux <u>expl</u>		sub	v	obj	(26)b
	tense	h * aux <u>expl</u>	sub	t _{sub}	v	obj	(26)b

2.4 Non-negative/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 just VP-external occurrence of an associate subject but occurrence in SpecTP that is prohibited in the presence of an adjacent overt expletive. While the clause-medial sequence *expletive < associate subject* is ruled out for existential constructions with non-negative associate subject, it is possible in existential constructions with a negative subject; cf. the contrast between (28) and (29).

- (28) 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
- (29) 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 does not occupy SpecTP, as there is a lower position for negative phrases (see fn. 10). A negative object cannot remain *in situ* in the Scandinavian languages but must undergo Negative Shift, which is assumed here to target SpecNegP (cf. NEG-Criterion; Haegeman & Zanuttini 1991, Haegeman 1995; on Negative Shift see K. K. Christensen 1986, 1987, Rögnvaldsson 1987, Jónsson 1996, Svenonius 2000, 2002, and K. R. Christensen 2005, Engels 2009a,b).⁸

- (30) a. *Ég hef [VP sagt **ekkert**] *Ic*
 a'. Ég hef [NegP **ekkert** [VP sagt t₀]]
 b. *Eg havi [VP sagt **einki**] *Fa*
 b'. Eg havi [NegP **einki** [VP sagt t₀]]
 c. *Jeg har [VP sagt **ingenting**] *Da*
 c'. Jeg har [NegP **ingenting** [VP sagt t₀]]
 I have (nothing) said (nothing)

Like negative objects, negative associate subjects cannot remain in VP but must move to the left of a non-finite verb, (31).

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

In Danish and Swedish, negative associate subjects differ from non-negative ones in that they precede a non-finite verb; compare (9), repeated here as (32), with (33).⁹

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

The above contrast between negative and non-negative associate subjects is accounted for by the assumption that SpecNegP may only host a negative phrase: Negative Shift takes place for licensing of [+neg]. A non-negative associate subject, in contrast, would have to move to SpecTP, which is not available in Mainland Scandinavian (cf. section 2.1).¹⁰

(34)	MSc: existential	CP - AgrSP	SpecTP	SpecNegP	V°	Comp	Adv	ex.
[-neg]	a	<u>expl</u> aux			v	sub _[-n]	adv	(32)a
	b	* <u>expl</u> aux		sub _[-n]	v	t _{sub}	adv	(32)b
	c	* <u>expl</u> aux	sub _[-n]		v	t _{sub}	adv	(32)b
[+neg]	d	* <u>expl</u> aux			v	sub _[+n]	adv	(33)a
	e	<u>expl</u> aux		sub _[+n]	v	t _{sub}	adv	(33)b
	f	* <u>expl</u> aux	sub _[+n]		v	t _{sub}	adv	-

In Faroese I, where both SpecTP and SpecNegP are in principle available to the associate subject of an existential construction, negative and non-negative associate subjects may

precede a non-finite verb if separated from the overt expletive by an intervening verb; cf. (28)a and (29)a. However, SpecTP differs from SpecNegP in that it is blocked by the presence of an adjacent overt expletive; cf. (28)b and (29)b.

(35)	Fa I: existential	CP – AgrSP	SpecTP	SpecNegP	V°	Comp	Adv	ex.
non-adjacent expletive	[-neg]	a	<u>expl</u> aux		v	sub _[-n]	adv	(2)a
		b	* <u>expl</u> aux	sub _[-n]	v	t _{sub}	adv	-
		c	<u>expl</u> aux	sub _[-n]	v	t _{sub}	adv	(28)a
	[+neg]	d	* <u>expl</u> aux		v	sub _[+n]	adv	(31)a
		e	<u>expl</u> aux	sub _[+n]	v	t _{sub}	adv	(29)a
		f	<u>expl</u> aux	sub _[+n]	v	t _{sub}	adv	(29)a
adjacent expletive	[-neg]	g	aux <u>expl</u>		v	sub _[-n]	adv	(1)a
		h	* aux <u>expl</u>	sub _[-n]	v	t _{sub}	adv	(28)b
		i	* aux <u>expl</u>	sub _[-n]	v	t _{sub}	adv	(28)b
	[+neg]	j	* aux <u>expl</u>		v	sub _[+n]	adv	-
		k	aux <u>expl</u>	sub _[+n]	v	t _{sub}	adv	(29)b
		l	* aux <u>expl</u>	sub _[+n]	v	t _{sub}	adv	-

Finally, note that a negative associate subject does not cancel out the co-occurrence restriction in TECs.

- (36) 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

- (37) 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 but needs to be licensed in SpecTP. Like a non-negative associate subject, a negative one thus has to move on to SpecTP in TECs, which is blocked in the presence of an adjacent overt expletive.

(38)	Fa I: TEC	CP - AgrSP	Spec TP	Spec NegP	Spec vP	V°	Comp	ex.
non- adjacent expletive	[-neg]	* <u>expl</u> aux			sub _[-n]	v	obj	-
		* <u>expl</u> aux		sub _[-n]	t _{sub}	v	obj	-
		<u>expl</u> aux	sub _[-n]		t _{sub}	v	obj	(36)a
	[+neg]	* <u>expl</u> aux			sub _[+n]	v	obj	-
		* <u>expl</u> aux		sub _[+n]	t _{sub}	v	obj	-
		<u>expl</u> aux	sub _[+n]	t _{sub}	t _{sub}	v	obj	(37)a
adjacent expletive	[-neg]	* aux <u>expl</u>			sub _[-n]	v	obj	(36)b
		* aux <u>expl</u>		sub _[-n]	t _{sub}	v	obj	(36)b
		* aux <u>expl</u>	sub _[-n]		t _{sub}	v	obj	(36)b
	[+neg]	* aux <u>expl</u>			sub _[+n]	v	obj	(37)b
		* aux <u>expl</u>		sub _[+n]	t _{sub}	v	obj	(37)b
		* aux <u>expl</u>	sub _[+n]	t _{sub}	t _{sub}	v	obj	(37)b

The hypothesis that the associate subject of a TEC must be licensed 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 present-day Mainland Scandinavian; i.e., although SpecNegP is available to the associate subject of an existential construction, (33), it cannot license the associate subject of a TEC, (39).

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

2.5 Summary

Though there are two subject positions in the IP domain in Faroese I (cf. section 2.1), they cannot be filled simultaneously by an overt expletive (SpecAgrSP) and an associate subject (SpecTP) if the constituents would appear adjacent (cf. section 2.2). As shown by the asymmetries between existential constructions and TECs with simple/complex tense (section 2.3) and negative/non-negative associate subject (section 2.4), the presence of an adjacent overt expletive only blocks an associate subject in SpecTP but not in a lower position in Faroese I (CompV° and SpecNegP, respectively). Notably, occurrence in SpecTP is not only

blocked for the associate subject of a TEC, which needs to be licensed in this position, but also for the associate subject of an existential construction, which can be licensed *in situ*, (2)a. In this connection notice that a trace in the complement position of V° would seem to suffice for licensing as a negative associate subject may occur in SpecNegP; cf. (29)b. This indicates that the co-occurrence restriction might not have to do with licensing of the associate subject in SpecTP but rather with the availability of the position itself.

As discussed in the following section, Mainland Scandinavian data from around 1900 points to the conclusion that the co-occurrence restriction is actually not confined to SpecTP but applies to associate subjects in VP-external subject licensing positions.

3 A similar co-occurrence restriction in Mainland Scandinavian around 1900

While TECs are ungrammatical in present-day Mainland Scandinavian, (cf. (15) and (39) above), traditional grammars present data that show that TECs were possible with negative and quantified associate subjects (Diderichsen 1946, Ljunggren 1926, Wallin 1936, Western 1921; see also K. K. Christensen 1991).

- (40) a. Der maa **ingen** sige det. Da
there must nobody say that (Diderichsen 1947: 187)
- b. Der kan **mange** sige det. No
there can many say that (Falk & Torp 1900: 8)
- c. Det kan **ingen** göra den saken bättre än han. Sw
there can nobody do this thing better than he Wallin (1936: 368)

Likewise, negative and quantified associate subjects in existential constructions could occur in clause-medial position.¹¹

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

- b. Det har **inga tidningar** kommit. Sw
there are no newspapers come Ljunggren (1926: 323)
- c. Der har **mange** ligget under åben himmel i nat. Da
there have many laid under open sky last night
(Mikkelsen 1911: 29)
- d. Der må da **nogen** have været hjemme. Da
there must really somebody have been at-home (Mikkelsen 1911: 29)

Van der Wurff (1999), Tanaka (2000) and Ingham (2003) report a similar restriction for Middle English: 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. (As v° is not a functional head, an associate subject could not remain in SpecvP and TECs with non-negative associate subject are thus ruled out.)

Following Ingham (2003), the restriction to TECs with negative/quantified associate subjects in former stages of Mainland Scandinavian can be captured by the assumption that SpecTP was unavailable in Mainland Scandinavian around 1900, just as it is in present-day Mainland Scandinavian, and that an associate subject could be licensed in SpecNeg/QP, which it cannot anymore.

Remarkably, 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. If some other constituent is topicalized, an overt expletive cannot appear: The clause-medial sequence *expletive < associate subject* is ungrammatical; cf. the (c)-examples in (42)-(44).

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

- (43) a. Der forlanger **ingen** det av dig. *No*
 b. Det forlanger ____ **ingen** av dig.
 c. *Det forlanger der **ingen** av dig.
it demand there nobody from you (Western 1921: 65)
- (44) a. Der har **mange** ønsket det samme. *No*
 b. Det samme har ____ **mange** ønsket.
 c. *Det samme har der **mange** ønsket.
the same have there many wished (Western 1921: 65)

Thus, an adjacent overt expletive apparently blocks an associate subject in SpecNeg/QP in Mainland Scandinavian around 1900. These facts suggest that the co-occurrence restriction has to do with the licensing of an associate subject (or, more precisely, the licensing of the licensing position; cf. section 2.5). It applies to associate subjects in VP-external subject licensing position only – SpecTP in Faroese I and SpecNeg/QP in former stages of Mainland Scandinavian. In present-day Scandinavian (both Faroese and Mainland Scandinavian), where SpecNegP is not a subject licensing position anymore, occurrence of an associate subject in SpecNegP is acceptable in the presence of an adjacent overt expletive (cf. section 2.4).

(45)	MSc 1900: TEC	CP – AgrSP	SpecTP	Spec Neg/QP	SpecvP	V°	Comp	ex.
non- adjacent expletive	[-n/q]	* <u>expl</u> aux			sub _[-n/q]	v	obj	-
		* <u>expl</u> aux		sub _[-n/q]	t _{sub}	v	obj	-
		* <u>expl</u> aux	sub _[-n/q]		t _{sub}	v	obj	-
	[+n/q]	* <u>expl</u> aux			sub _[+n/q]	v	obj	-
		* <u>expl</u> aux		sub _[+n/q]	t _{sub}	v	obj	(43)a
		* <u>expl</u> aux	sub _[+n/q]	t _{sub}	t _{sub}	v	obj	-
adjacent expletive	[-n/q]	* aux <u>exp</u>			sub _[-n/q]	v	obj	-
		* aux <u>expl</u>		sub _[-n/q]	t _{sub}	v	obj	-
		* aux <u>expl</u>	sub _[-n/q]		t _{sub}	v	obj	-
	[+n/q]	* aux <u>expl</u>			sub _[+n/q]	v	obj	(43)a
		* aux <u>expl</u>		sub _[+n/q]	t _{sub}	v	obj	(43)c
		* aux <u>expl</u>	sub _[+n/q]	t _{sub}	t _{sub}	v	obj	(43)c

Recall that in Faroese I, even the associate subject of an existential construction, which can be licensed *in situ*, cannot occur in SpecTP in the presence of an adjacent overt expletive. Similarly, Falk & Torp (1900: 10) present data that show that an expletive and a quantified associate subject could not co-occur in clause-medial positions in existential constructions.

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

If my proposal is on the right track and VP-external subject licensing positions are blocked in the presence of an adjacent overt expletive, it is expected that the clause-medial sequence *expletive < negative associate subject* in (47), which is acceptable in present-day Mainland Scandinavian, was ungrammatical at an earlier stage, where associate subjects could be licensed in SpecNegP; cf. the contrast between (39) and (40) above. Unfortunately, I could not find an equivalent example in the grammars mentioned above.

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

4 Conclusion

Though there are two subject positions in the IP domain in Faroese I, SpecAgrSP for the expletive and SpecTP for the associate subject (cf. section 2.1), these positions cannot be filled simultaneously if expletive and associate subject would appear adjacent (cf. section 2.2). Asymmetries between existential constructions and TECs with simple/complex tense and non-negative/negative associate subject show that the sequence *expletive* < *associate subject* is not prohibited as such: An associate subject may occur adjacent to an overt expletive if it occupies a lower position, CompV° and SpecNegP, respectively; cf. sections 2.3 and 2.4. Data from Mainland Scandinavian around 1900 point out that the co-occurrence restriction is not confined to SpecTP but applies to associate subjects in a VP-external subject licensing position. Finally, the fact that even the associate subject of an existential construction, which can be licensed (by a trace) *in situ*, is affected by the co-occurrence restriction would seem to suggest that the presence of an adjacent overt expletive conflicts with the availability of the subject licensing position itself rather than with licensing of an associate subject in this position.

References

- Bentzen, Kristine, Piotr Garbacz, Caroline Heycock and Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson. 2009. On variation in Faroese verb placement. To appear in *Nordlyd. Tromsø University Working Papers on Language and Linguistics*.
- 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. Ö. Dahl & A. Holmberg, 21-35. 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. R.D.S. Allan & M.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. 2009a. Scandinavian negative indefinites and cyclic linearization. Submitted to *Syntax*.
- Engels, Eva. 2009b. Microvariation in object positions. Negative Shift in Scandinavian. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 83, 83-102.
- 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.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 1995. *The syntax of negation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haegeman, Liliane and Raffaella Zanuttini. 1991. Negation heads and the Neg-criterion. *The Linguistic Review* 8, 233-251.
- 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.
- 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. C. Hedlund and A. 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. W. Abraham, S.D. Epstein, H. Thráinsson, and C.J.W. 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*, A. van Kemenade and N. Vincent (eds.), 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. H. de Hoop and T. van der Wouden, 159-170. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ljunggren, Ragnar. 1926. *Om den opersonliga konstruktionen*. Uppsala: Berlings nya boktryckeri.
- Mikkelsen, Kristian. 1911. *Dansk Ordføjningslære. Med sproghistoriske Tillæg*. København: Lehmann & Stage.
- Rögnvaldsson, 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. R.D.S. Allan and M.P. Barnes, 33-49. University College London.
- 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. P. 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, H Höskuldur, Hjalmar Petersen, Jógvan í Lon Jacobsen and Zakaris Svabo Hansen. 2004. *Faroese – an overview and reference grammar*. Tórshavn: Føroya Fróðskaparfelag.
- Vangsnes, Øystein. A. 2002. Icelandic expletive constructions and the distribution of subject types. In *Subjects, Expletives, and the Extended Projection Principle*, ed. P. 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.
- 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.

¹ This pattern was displayed by about 2/3 of my informants. The rest of the informants, who rejected (2)b, will be disregarded in the following. They showed the Mainland Scandinavian pattern with regard to the distribution of associate subjects.

³ Co-occurrence of an overt expletive and an associate subject in clause-medial positions is also possible in Icelandic.

- ⁴ In contrast to main clauses, (1), overt expletives are obligatory in embedded clauses in Faroese, (i).

- ⁵ According to Jonas (1996a), V°-to-I° movement is permitted in Faroese I.

- 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 those of my Faroese informants who did not accept clause-medial occurrence of an associate subject whereas it was judged slightly better, though still strongly marked, by the Faroese I informants; see also Bentzen et al. (2009).

(i) Tað hava nakrir hundar verið úti í garðinum. Fa I
 there have some dogs been out in garden-the

⁷ As there are semantic restrictions on associate subjects in clause-medial and post-lexical position (see Vangsnes 2002), the acceptability of (22)b (but not the acceptability of (22)a) is expected to be dependent on the type of DP.

⁹ 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
- (ii) a. *Det har vært **ingen hunder** i hagen. No
b. *Det har **ingen hunder** vært t_o i hagen.
there have (no dogs) been (no dogs) in garden-the
- (iii) Det var **ingen hunder** t_v t_o i hagen. No
there were no dogs in garden-the

¹⁰ Note that TP must dominate NegP: An associate subject precedes an Object Shifted object, (12), and an Object Shifted object precedes a Negative Shifted one, (i).

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

¹¹ Ljunggren (1926: 323) claims that a quantified object may occur to the left of a non-finite verb, too (see also Western 1921: 221/22).

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

Quantifier Shift was possible in all Scandinavian languages and optionally applies in present-day Icelandic, (ii); cf. Rögnvaldsson (1987), Jónsson (1996), Svenonius (2000), Thráinsson (2007).

- (ii) 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)