Icelandic

This assignment has to do with certain familiar processes in the syntax of Icelandic. The processes are familiar in broad terms, but Icelandic has a quirky charm which leaves its own very distinctive mark on these otherwise familiar syntactic patterns.

Even less than in most assignments, there is no expected ‘right answer’ here. Certain things below are reasonably clear. Certain things are far from clear. Your goal should be to engage with the data in a thoughtful and serious way and to integrate it, to the extent possible, into the framework of assumptions that we have gradually been assembling.

Background

Icelandic is a Verb Second language (like all the Germanic languages except modern English), whose Verb Second (V2) structures are built on an SVO foundation. In this it is like all the Scandinavian languages. It is unlike the other Scandinavian languages in a number of important ways however:

(i) It has preserved a full system of agreement inflection for finite verbs.
(ii) Like French (and Romance languages in general) it has generalized v-to-T Raising. That is, all verbs raise to T in finite clauses. It has often been speculated that this property is related in some way to property (i).
(iii) It has preserved a full set of case-distinctions in its nominal system, distinguishing among nominative, accusative, genitive and dative.
(iv) Its V2 clauses appear freely in embedded contexts of all kinds. In this it is unlike the generality of V2 languages, but is like Yiddish.
(v) It has overt (optional) Object Shift. That is, objects may undergo A-movement to a position to the left of and above VP. Most Scandinavian languages have Object Shift only for pronouns. In Icelandic, Object Shift is obligatory for pronouns and optional for full DPs (with consequences for interpretation).

You can ignore the V2 character of Icelandic finite clauses in what follows. We will deal only with subject-initial V2 clauses and it will be harmless, for the most part, to pretend for the present that they represent the usual kind of SVX pattern (subject in the specifier position of TP, verb raised into the T-position). Similarly, it will do no harm to forget the fact that the language has overt Object Shift and assume that objects are surface complements of V. These are, in fact, the structures which are ‘later’ transformed into Verb Second Object-Shifted structures. The sentences in (1)–(6) illustrate these properties of the language and also illustrate some fairly routine aspects of its clause structure, along with some familiar A-movement constructions:¹

(1) Við kusum stelpuna.
   we[NOM] elected[P1] the-girl[ACC]
   ‘We elected the girl.’

(2) Stelpan var kosin.
   the-girl was[3SG] elected[NOM, SG, FEM]
   ‘The girl was elected.’

(3) þið stækkuðuða garðana.
   you[NOM, PL] enlarged[P2] the-gardens[ACC]
   ‘You enlarged the gardens.’

¹Definite articles are suffixes on the noun.
(4) Garðarnir staðkuðu.
    the-gardens[NOM] enlarged[P3]
    'The gardens enlarged.'

(5) þær eru kaldar.
    they[NOM,PL,FEM] be[PRES, P3] cold[NOM,PL,FEM]
    'They are cold.'

(6) þær virðast hafa verið kosnar.
    they[NOM,PL,FEM] seem[P3] have been elected[NOM,PL,FEM]
    'They seem to have been elected.'

So far so familiar.

More exotic (from an English perspective at any rate) is the existence of impersonal structures like (7):

(7) þær sungu ekkí bær í kirkjunni í dag.
    they sang not children in the-church today
    'No children sang in church today.'

And alongside personal passives of a familiar kind, we also have structures such as (8):

(8) þær voru lesnar fjórar bækur.
    there were read[NOM,PL] four[NOM,PL] books[NOM,PL]
    'Four books were read.'

Examples (9) and (10) illustrate how particular predicates can l-select particular cases for their complements:

(9) Við hjálpuðum/bjargaðum/heilsuðum stelpunum.
    we[NOM] helped/rescued/greeted[P1] the-girls[DAT,PL]
    'we helped/rescued/greeted the girls.'

(10) Við söknuðum/leituðum/gættum hennar.
    we[NOM] missed/searched-for/looked-after[P1] her[GEN]
    'we missed/searched-for/looked-after her.'

Many other verbs similarly assign a particular ('inherent') case to an internal argument. The verbs steal and return (as in a book to a library), for instance, both assign dative case to their theme arguments. Watch out for these verbs in what follows.

Passives

Consider (11)–(12):

(11) Henni var hjálpað/bjargað/heilsað.
    her[DAT] was helped/rescued/greeted[MASC,NOM,SG]
    'She was helped/rescued/greeted.'

(12) Hennar var söknuðum/leituðum/gættum hennar.
    her[GEN] was missed/searched-for/looked-after[MASC,NOM,SG]
    'She was missed/searched-for/looked-after.'

(13) þeim virðist hafa verið hjálpað.
    them[DAT] seems have been helped[MASC,NOM,SG]
    'They seem to have been helped.'
The passive participles in (12) and (13) are glossed as ‘MASC,NOM,SG’; in fact, this is the default, or citation form (which happens to be identical in form with the MASC,NOM,SG form). We will not gloss every such participle in subsequent examples. If you encounter a passive participle with no such gloss, you should assume that it is in its default form.

(14) \(\text{Verkjannat } \text{er talið} \text{ ekki gæta}\)
\[\text{the-pains[GEN] is believed NEG be-noticeable[FIN]}\]
‘The pains are believed not to be noticeable.’

(We gloss and translate (14) using an English adjective; in fact, though, \textit{gæta} is a verb meaning (among other things) ‘to be perceptible, noticeable’.) For the case of impersonal passives, we see the pattern in (15):

(15) a. \(\text{það hafði verið stolið einum stól.}\)
\[\text{there had been stolen one[DAT] chair[DAT]}\]
‘One chair had been stolen.’

b. \(\text{það var skilað fórum bókum.}\)
\[\text{there was returned four[DAT,PL] books[DAT,PL]}\]
‘Four books were returned.’

c. \(\text{það var bjárdað nokkrum strákum af fjallinu.}\)
\[\text{there was rescued some[DAT] boys[DAT] from the-mountain}\]
‘Some boys were rescued from the mountain.’

It would take too much time and space to document it here, but the dative argument in cases like (15) is subject to the definiteness restriction familiar from, say, English existential constructions. And unsurprisingly, (15c) (for instance) alternates with the equally possible (16):

(16) \(\text{nokkrum strákum var bjárdað af fjallinu.}\)
\[\text{some[DAT] boys[DAT] was rescued from the-mountain}\]
‘Some boys were rescued from the mountain.’

For completeness, we can add (17) and (18):

(17) a. \(\text{Fjórir bílar mundu hafa verið seldir.}\)
\[\text{four[NOM,PL] cars[NOM,PL] would have been sold}\]
‘Four cars would have been sold.’

b. \(\text{það mundu fjórir bílar hafa verið seldir.}\)

b. \(\text{það mundu fjórir bílar hafa verið seldir fjórir bílar.}\)

c. \(\text{það mundu hafa verið seldir fjórir bílar.}\)

(18) a. \(\text{Fjórum bílum mundi hafa verið stolið stól.}\)
\[\text{four[DAT,PL] cars[DAT,PL] would have been stolen}\]
‘Four cars would have been stolen.’

b. \(\text{það mundi fjórum bílum hafa verið stolið.}\)

b. \(\text{það mundi hafa verið stolið fjórum bílum.}\)

c. \(\text{það mundi hafa verið stolið fjórum bílum.}\)

With this much in hand, answer the following two questions:

(i) To what extent are the properties of this subsystem as laid out so far in accord with theoretical expectation, given the set of theoretical and analytical assumptions we have developed in the course of the quarter?

(ii) What adjustments, if any, (language-particular or general) would have to be made to that body of hypotheses in order to accommodate the observations made so far?
Quirky Subjects

One of the most celebrated syntactic properties of Icelandic is that it also permits inherently case-marked DP’s to occur in subject-position. You have seen this property already, but it is illustrated further and more completely in what follows.

(19) Okkur vantaði vinnu.
    us[ACC] lacked a-job[NOM]
    ‘We lacked/needed a job.’

(20) Henni batnaði.
    her[DAT] recovered
    ‘She recovered.’

(21) Henni áskotnaðist mikli peningar.
    her[DAT] lucked-into much[NOM] money[NOM]
    ‘She had the good fortune to get a lot of money.’

(22) Henni mistókst allar tilraunirnar.
    her[DAT] failed all the-attempts[NOM]
    ‘All her efforts failed.’

(23) Henni skruppu fætur.
    her[DAT] failed feet[NOM]
    ‘She stumbled.’

(24) Henni leiddust strákarnir.
    her[DAT] bored the-boys[NOM]
    ‘She found the boys boring.’

(25) Henni líkuðu ekki þessar athugasemdir.
    her[DAT] liked NEG these[NOM] comments[NOM]
    ‘She did not like these comments.’

(26) Hana þyrstir.
    her[ACC] thirsts
    ‘She is thirsty.’

(27) Henni var óglatt.
    her[DAT] was nauseous
    ‘She felt nauseous.’

(28) Strákunum hafði verið kalt.
    the-boys[DAT,PL] had been cold
    ‘The boys had been (felt) cold.’

(29) Henni ógnar hættan.
    her[DAT] terrifies the-danger[NOM]
    ‘The danger terrifies her.’

(30) Barninu batnaði veikin.
    the-child[DAT] bettered the-disease[NOM]
    ‘The child recovered from the disease.’

(31) Vindsins gætir ekki.
    the-wind[GEN] matters not
    ‘The wind doesn’t matter.’
Mért býður við setningafræði.
'I loathe syntax.'

Honum svipar til frænda síns.
'He resembles his cousin.'

Hana hryllir við hættuni.
'The danger horrifies her.'

Assume that the examples in (19)–(34) are representative of the classes of predicates that allow quirky case-marked subjects (this is true). Assume also that the clause-initial ír’s in (19)–(34) actually are subjects (rather than fronted topics or whatever). This has also been very well established.

(i) What generalizations govern the assignment of inherent case in Icelandic?
(ii) How can we understand the syntax of (19)–(34)? In thinking about this you should focus especially on the mechanisms of case assignment and on the mechanisms by which ‘subject position’ gets filled.

It may be useful for you to know that it is systematically impossible to passivize verbs which assign inherent case:

It should hardly come as a surprise at this point that there are also impersonal versions of these structures:

And a final observation: it should hardly come as a surprise at this point that there are also impersonal versions of these structures:

Agreement

In this final section we will be explicit about some important facts which have so far been mostly passed over in silence. These facts have to do with the way agreement works. Contrast (37a) with (37b), paying special attention to the way agreement works itself out:

(37) a. Bækurnar voru lesnar.
'the-books[NOM,PL] were[P3] read[NOM,PL]
'The books were read.'

b. Bókunum var skilað.
'the-books[DAT,PL] was returned
'The books were returned.'

(38) a. það voru lesnar fjórar bækur.
'The books were returned.'
b. það var skilað fjórum bókum.
   ‘Four books were read.’

b. það var skilað fjórum bókum.
   ‘Four books were returned.’

c. það virðist hafa verið stolið þrem stólum á upphoðinu.
   ‘Three chairs seem to have been stolen at the auction.’

The finite verb in (38c), (38b) and in (37b) appears in a default 3rd sg form. Similarly the participle in (38b) and in (37b). A similar contrast can be seen in (39):

(39) a. Við lásuð bókina.
       we read[p] the-book
       ‘We read the book.’

b. Ókkur vantaði bókina.
       us[d] lacked the-book
       ‘We lacked/needed the book.’

And now a more dramatic (but similar) pair of cases:

(40) a. Einhverjur bátar voru taldir hafa verið keyptir.
       some[n] boats[n] were[p] believed[n] have been bought[n]
       ‘Some boats were believed to have been bought.’

b. þeim virðist hafa verið hjálpað.
       them[d] seems[s] have[FIN] been helped[n,sg,mas]
       ‘They seem to have been helped.’

In (40a), with a surface nominative subject, there is agreement; in (40b), with a surface dative subject, the verb and associated participles appear in the default 3rd sg form.

How far can you go in integrating this observation into the understanding you have built up so far of how the Icelandic system works, and of how it might reflect the operation of general syntactic principles?