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

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

¹ Equivalent examples are presented as (marginally) acceptable in Thráinsson et al. (2004: 285/86). However, my informants, who were asked to judge the acceptability of the test sentences on a scale from 5 (good) to 1 (bad), clearly rejected the construction in (3). Median for the construction in (1): 5, in (2)b: 4,5 and in (3): 1.
The paper investigates the ban on clause-medial co-occurrence of overt expletive and associate subject in Faroese I. Section 2 argues in favor of two subject positions in the IP domain, SpecAgrSP for the expletive and SpecTP for the associate subject. However, as discussed in section 3.1, simultaneous filling of these two positions is only possible if the overt expletive and the associate subject are separated by the finite verb. This is accounted for by the assumption that the associate subject requires local licensing by a c-commanding verb. Asymmetries between existential constructions and transitive expletive constructions (TEC) with simple and complex tense (section 3.2) and with non-negative and negative associate subject (section 3.3) indicate that the licensing condition only applies to associate subjects in SpecTP in Faroese: The sequence expletive – associate subject is possible as long as the associate subject occurs in a lower position (V°-Comp and SpecNegP, respectively). Mainland Scandinavian data from around 1900 presented in section 4 point to the conclusion that the co-occurrence restriction is not confined to associate subjects in SpecTP after all but more generally applies to associate subjects in positions in which a TEC subject can be licensed. Section 5 summarizes the results.
2 The structure of IP

2.1 Two subject positions in the IP domain

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

² Christer Platzack (p.c.) pointed out to me that the associate subject may occur to the left of a non-finite verb in impersonal bli-passives in Swedish, giving rise to examples like (i), where the expletive occurs string-adjacent to the associate subject:
As regards occurrence of an overt expletive in subject position, Faroese seems to be between Icelandic and Mainland Scandinavian as overt expletives are optional in all varieties of Faroese; see (1) above repeated here as (11). However, Faroese II differs from Faroese I in that an associate subject cannot occur to the left of a non-finite verb; compare (2) with (12).

(11) a. Í dag hava tað verið nakrir hundar úti í garðinum.  
    b. Í dag hava verið nakrir hundar úti í garðinum.

(12) a. Tað hava verið nakrir hundar úti í garðinum.  
    b. *Tað hava nakrir hundar verið úti í garðinum.

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

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

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

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

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
(13) & \text{Ic} & \text{SpecCP} & C^\circ & \text{SpecIP} & V^\circ & \text{Comp} \quad \text{Adv} \\
\hline
a. & * & XP & aux & expl & \ldots & v & \text{sub} & \text{adv} \\
b. & & XP & aux & \ldots & v & \text{sub} & \text{adv} \\
c. & expl & aux & \ldots & v & \text{sub} & \text{adv} \\
d. & expl & aux & \text{sub} & \ldots & v & t_{\text{sub}} & \text{adv} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{ex.} \]

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

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
(14) & \text{MSc} & \text{SpecCP} & C^\circ & \text{SpecIP} & V^\circ & \text{Comp} \quad \text{Adv} \\
\hline
a. & XP & aux & expl & \ldots & v & \text{sub} & \text{adv} \\
b. & * & XP & aux & \ldots & v & \text{sub} & \text{adv} \\
c. & expl & aux & t_{\text{expl}} & \ldots & v & \text{sub} & \text{adv} \\
d. & * & expl & aux & t_{\text{expl}} & \text{sub} & \ldots & v & t_{\text{sub}} & \text{adv} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{ex.} \]

Under the above assumptions, Faroese I would have to have both expletive topics and expletive subjects: An overt expletive may be inserted in SpecIP as it can optionally occur in this position, (1), or it may be inserted in SpecCP, permitting movement of the associate subject to SpecIP, (2); see also (15) below. Moreover, the prohibition against the clause-medial sequence \textit{expletive - associate subject} shown in (3) above would follow from the fact that the two constituents compete for the same position, (15)e.
However, the pattern observed in Faroese II is problematic for the above analysis. Overt expletives in SpecIP are optional in all varieties of Faroese, but associate subjects cannot occur to the left of a non-finite verb in Faroese II; see (11) and (12) above. Thus, although an overt expletive apparently need not be inserted in SpecIP, the associate subject cannot occupy this position. This is unexpected under the assumption that the possibility of not having an overt expletive in subject position paves the way for the associate subject to occur to the left of a non-finite verb. Instead, the data strongly suggest that these two phenomena are not directly related.

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

\begin{align*}
(16)\quad & \text{a. } \ldots \text{ hvort } \text{það} \text{ hefur einher útlendingur verið } \ldots \quad Ic \\
& \text{b. } \ldots \text{ hvort } \text{ hefur einher útlendingur verið } \ldots \\
& \quad \quad \ldots \text{ í sumarhúsinu.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{whether (there) has some foreigner been} \\
\text{in summerhouse-the}
\end{align*}

\(\text{(Thráinsson 2007: 26)}\)

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

\begin{align*}
(15) \quad & \text{Fa I SpecCP } C^o \quad \text{SpecIP } V^o \quad \text{Comp Adv} \\
\text{a. } & \text{XP aux expl } \ldots \text{ v sub adv} \\
\text{b. } & \text{XP aux } \ldots \text{ v sub adv} \\
\text{c. } & \text{expl aux } \ldots \text{ v sub adv} \\
\text{d. } & \text{expl aux sub } \ldots \text{ v t}^\text{sub adv} \\
\text{e. } & \text{*XP aux expl sub } \ldots \text{ v t}^\text{sub adv}
\end{align*}

\(\text{(1a)}\)

\(\text{(1b)}\)

\(\text{(2a)}\)

\(\text{(2b)}\)

\(\text{(3)}\)

\(\text{(Thráinsson et al. 2004: 283)}\)
That the overt expletive in (16)a occupies SpecIP is corroborated by the fact that embedded questions prohibit topicalisation, independent of whether or not the expletive is present. The ungrammatical sentences in (17)b and (17)c indicate that CP recursion is not allowed in embedded questions. Thus, the expletive in (16)a and (17)a must occupy SpecIP.

(17) Prófessorinn langaði að vita ...  
    professor-the wanted to know 
    a. [CP hvort [IP bað hefði einhver lokið ritgerðinni]]
    b. *[CP hvort [CP í gær hefði [IP bað einhver lokið ritgerðinni]]
    c. *[CP hvort [CP í gær hefði [IP einhver lokið ritgerðinni]]
       if yesterday had (there) someone finished thesis-the
       (Vangsnes 2002: 47)

In addition, the examples in (16)a and (17)a show that an overt expletive in SpecIP can in fact co-occur with an associate subject to the left of a non-finite verb in an embedded clause. As illustrated in (18), this is also marginally acceptable in Faroese I.

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

Thus, the above data point to the conclusion that there are two subject positions to the left of a non-finite verb and consequently contradict the hypothesis that the ungrammaticality of the clause-medial sequence expletive – associate subject in (3) results from the fact that the two constituents compete for the same position.

Note that there is evidence that an associate subject to the left of a non-finite verb appears in the IP domain. It precedes all non-finite auxiliaries, (19), and, as Bobaljik & Jonas (1996) observe, it precedes an object that has moved out of VP
by Object Shift in a transitive expletive construction like (20); see Holmberg (1986, 1999) and Engels & Vikner (2007) on Object Shift.

(19) a. Það mun hafa verið göð mynd ... Ic
    b. *Það mun hafa göð mynd verið ... 
    c. Það mun göð mynd hafa verið ... 
       ... i sjónvarpinu.

    there must good film have been on TV

(20) a. Það borðuðu margir strákar bjúgun ekki. Ic
    there ate many boys sausages-the not

    (Bobaljik & Jonas 1996: 214)
    b. ?Það drekka sennilega sumir krakkar hana aldrei.
    there drink probably some kids it never

    (Vangsnes 2002: 45)

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

2.2 Cross-linguistic variation as to the structure of IP

The previous section argued for two subject positions in the IP domain, SpecAgrSP and SpecTP. However, the availability of SpecTP would seem to be subject to cross-linguistic variation. While an associate subject may occur to the left of a non-finite verb in Icelandic and Faroese I, this is ungrammatical in Mainland Scandinavian and Faroese II; compare (2) and (8) with (10) and (12) above, repeated in (21)-(24).
This variation correlates with contrasts as to the acceptability of transitive expletive constructions (TECs): TECs are only possible in languages where SpecTP is available. They are acceptable in Icelandic, (25), and Faroese I, (26), but ungrammatical in Faroese II, (27), and Mainland Scandinavian, (28).

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

(i)  a. Der skal nogen passe dem. 
there should somebody care-for them
Falster
b. Har der nogen sagt dig det?
has there somebody told you this
Eastern Jutland
c. Så havde der en hund bit dem i buksebenene.
so had there a dog bit them in trousers-the
Sjælland
(Pedersen & Sørensen, forthcoming)

(ii)  a. Så kunne der godt en damper løbe over dem.
so could there well a steamer run over them
Sjælland
b. Nu vil der snart én drukne.
now will there soon one drown
Eastern Jutland
c. Har der nogen været inde ved dig?
has there somebody been in by you
Western Jutland
(Pedersen & Sørensen, forthcoming)
The above contrast is accounted for by the assumption that the associate subject of a TEC cannot remain in its VP-internal base position, SpecvP. In Icelandic and Faroese I, the associate subject can be licensed in SpecTP. In contrast, in Faroese II and Mainland Scandinavian, where SpecTP is not available, the associate subject cannot be licensed and consequently TECs are ungrammatical. (Unavailable positions are marked by shading in (29).)

(i)  a. *... að það *mundi hafa einher borðað petta epili. 
    b. *... að það mundi hafa einher borðað petta epili. 
    c. ... að það mundi einher hafa borðað petta epili. 
       that there would somebody have eaten this apple 

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

5 Note that the associate subject of a TEC must precede all non-finite verbs.
In contrast to TECs, the associate subject of an existential construction can be licensed in its base position (as complement of V°; see Vikner 1995). In addition, it may move to and be licensed in SpecTP if this position is available in the given language. This is illustrated in (30).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(29) TEC CP – AgrSP SpecTP SpecvP V° Comp ex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ic/ a. * expl v sub t sub t v obj -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa I b. expl v sub t sub t v obj (25)/(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc/ c. * expl v sub t sub t v obj (27)/(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa II d. * expl v sub t sub t v obj (27)/(28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No SpecTP in MSc/Fa II**

licensing of TEC associate subject in SpecTP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(30) existential CP – AgrSP SpecTP V° Comp Adv ex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ic/ a. expl aux v sub adv (2)a/(8)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa I b. expl aux sub v t sub adv (2)b/(8)b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc/ c. expl aux v sub adv (10)a/(12)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa II d. * expl aux sub v t sub adv (10)b/(12)b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No SpecTP in MSc/Fa II**

licensing of existential associate subject in SpecTP

licensing of existential subject in V°-Comp

The variation across the Scandinavian languages as to the availability of SpecTP has been considered to be due to a structural contrast between the languages (i.e. the position is not projected at all in some varieties, e.g. Bobaljik & Thráinsson 1998 and Koeneman & Neeleman 2001) or to differences in checking requirements (i.e. though present, the position cannot be occupied by an associate subject, e.g. Bobaljik & Jonas 1996 and Vangsnes 2002). For reasons of exposition, I will follow the former analysis here but nothing hinges on this assumption.
In addition, the approaches to expletive constructions differ in the theoretical implementation of why the availability of SpecTP varies across the Scandinavian languages (see Richards 2006). Basically, two main camps can be distinguished: (a) those approaches which attribute the (non)availability of SpecTP to the presence/absence of full DP Object Shift (Bures' generalisation; e.g. Bures 1992, 1993, Bobaljik & Jonas 1996, Koster & Zwart 2001, and Richards 2006), and (b) those approaches which attribute it to verb movement (Vikner's generalisation; e.g. Vikner 1990, 1995, Sigurðsson 1991, Bobaljik & Thráinsson 1998, and Koeneman & Neeleman 2001).

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

(31) a. Eg las íkkí bókina.  
    b. *Eg las bókina íkkí.  

I read book-the not

(Thráinsson et al. 2004: 245)

According to Vikner's generalisation, the availability of a clause-medial position for the associate subject presupposes V2 and V°-to-I° movement. While all of the Scandinavian languages are V2, they vary as to V°-to-I° movement. V°-to-I° movement takes place in embedded clauses in Icelandic but not in Mainland Scandinavian (at least not to the same extent; see Bentzen 2007 and Wiklund et al. 2007). Moreover, Bobaljik & Jonas (1996) and Jonas (1996a,b) claim that embedded V°-to-I° movement is optional in Faroese I but ungrammatical in Faroese II. Comparison with data on verb movement collected by Kristine Bentzen, Piotr Garbacz, Caroline Heycock, and Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson during the NORMS Dialect Workshop on the Faroe Islands showed that V°-to-I° movement in embedded clauses was rejected by my Faroese II informants whereas it was judged slightly better, though still strongly marked, by my Faroese I informants. (See also Bentzen et al. 2009 on Faroese verb movement).
(32) a. *Það kom á óvart að María ekki les bækur.  
    b. Pað kom á óvart að María les ekki bækur.  
    it was unexpected that Maria read not books  
    (Jonas 1996b: 173)

(33) a. Eg spurdi hví Jógvan ikki hevði lisið bókina.  
    b. Eg spurdi hví Jógvan hevði ikki lisið bókina.  
    I asked why Jogvan had not read book-the  
    (Jonas 1996a: 95)

(34) a. Eg spurdi hví Jógvan ikki hevði lisið bókina.  
    b. *Eg spurdi hví Jógvan hevði ikki lisið bókina.  
    I asked why Jogvan had not read book-the  
    (Jonas 1996a: 95)

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

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

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

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

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

3  Local licensing of associate subjects in SpecTP

3.1 Position of the finite verb

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

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

b. *Allarhelst hefur tað onkur keypt husið hjá Róa. probably has there somebody bought house-the of Roa

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

(37) a. ?Hon spurdi um tað høvdu nakrir hundar verið úti í garðinum. she asked if there had some dogs been out in garden-the
Recall that V°-to-I° movement is optional in embedded clauses in Faroese I, (33). Interestingly, simultaneous filling of SpecAgrSP and SpecTP is ungrammatical if V°-to-I° movement does not take place, as shown by the example in (38).

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

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

---

8 This hypothesis is also corroborated by the fact that the sequence *expletive – associate subject* is acceptable as long as the associate subject does not occur in SpecTP; see sections 3.2 and 3.3 below.
b. *Í dag hevur tað kanska onkur keypt húsið hjá Róa.

today has there maybe somebody bought house-the of Roa

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

(40) a. Tað hava nakrir hundar verið úti í garðinum.

there have some dogs been out in garden-the

b. Tað keypti onkur húsið hjá Róa.

there bought somebody house-the of Roa

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

---

Note that only overt constituents count for licensing. First, checking has to be carried out by the verb in its surface position. If it could be done by the verb trace in AgrS°, the ungrammaticality of (36) would be unexpected. Second, given that the overt expletive is always merged in SpecAgrSP, from where it may move to SpecCP, the sentences in (40) indicate that only the overt expletive but not its trace in SpecAgrSP blocks local licensing.
(41) a. Tað hava kansa nakri hundar verið úti í garðinum.  
there have maybe some dogs been out in garden-the

b. Tað hefur kansa onkur keypt húsið hjá Róa.  
there has maybe somebody bought house-the of Roa

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(42) Fa I</th>
<th>Spec CP</th>
<th>C°</th>
<th>Spec AgrSP</th>
<th>AgrS°</th>
<th>Spec TP</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>Aux°</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>V°</th>
<th>ex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>local</td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>expl</td>
<td>aux</td>
<td>texpl</td>
<td>taux</td>
<td>sub</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>taux</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>licensing</td>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>expl</td>
<td>aux</td>
<td>sub</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>taux</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>(37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no local</td>
<td>c.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>aux</td>
<td>taux</td>
<td>sub</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>taux</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>licensing</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>expl</td>
<td>sub</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>aux</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>(38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### 3.2 Simple versus complex tense

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

---

10 As there are semantic restrictions on associate subjects in clause-medial and post-lexical position (see Vangsnes 2002), the acceptability of (43)b is expected to be dependent on the type of DP.
In contrast to existential constructions, TECs do not permit the sequence expletive – associate subject at all, irrespective of simple or complex tense.

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

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

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

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

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

(50) a. Tað hava eingir hundar verið úti í garðinum.Fa I
   b. Í morgun hava tað eingir hundar verið úti í garðinum.
      in morning-the have there no dogs been out in garden-the
There is reason to believe that a negative associate subject to the left of a non-finite verb need not occupy SpecTP as there is a special position for negative phrases in the IP domain. Under a sentential negation reading, a negative object cannot remain in situ in the Scandinavian languages but must undergo Negative Shift: The negative phrase moves to SpecNegP, where it checks its [+negative] feature (see K. K. Christensen 1986, 1987, Rögnvaldsson 1987, Jónsson 1996, Svenonius 2000, 2002, K. R. Christensen 2005, and Engels 2009, to appear on Negative Shift).

(51) a. *Ég hef [VP sagt ekkert] 
   a'. Ég hef [NegP ekkert] [VP sagt to]

   b. *Eg havi [VP sagt einki] 
   b'. Eg havi [NegP einki] [VP sagt to]

   c. *Jeg har [VP sagt ingenting] 
   c'. Jeg har [NegP ingenting] [VP sagt to]

   I have nothing said

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

(52) a. Jeg sa ingenting tv to.
   b. *Jeg har ingenting sagt to.

(i) a. Jeg sa ingenting tv to.  
    I said nothing

   b. *Jeg har ingenting sagt to.
    I have nothing said

11 While string-vacuous Negative Shift is possible in all Scandinavian languages, there is a considerable amount of cross-linguistic variation as to non-string-vacuous Negative Shift; see Engels (2009, to appear). For instance in Norwegian, Negative Shift cannot cross a verb in situ, (i). As a consequence, negative associate subjects are ruled out in existential constructions with complex tense, (ii), while they may appear in constructions with simple tense, where Negative Shift can apply string-vacuously, (iii).
The above contrast between negative and non-negative associate subjects as to the ability to occur to the left of a non-finite verb is accounted for by the assumption that SpecNegP may only host a negative phrase: Negative Shift takes place for checking of [+negative] and consequently may only affect constituents with a corresponding feature. A non-negative associate subject to the left of a non-finite verb, in contrast, would have to occur in SpecTP, which is not available in Mainland Scandinavian and Faroese II (see section 2). This is illustrated in (56).  

(ii) a. *Det har vært ingen hunder i hagen.  
b. Det har ingen hunder vært to i hagen.  

(iii) Det var ingen hunder tv to i hagen.  

12 Note that TP dominates NegP: An associate subject precedes an Object Shifted object, (20), and an Object Shifted object precedes a Negative Shifted one, (i).
As illustrated in (49)a and (50)a above, both non-negative and negative associate subjects may precede a non-finite verb in Faroese I, where both SpecTP and SpecNegP are in principle available to the associate subject of an existential construction. However, in contrast to a non-negative associate subject in SpecTP, a negative one in SpecNegP would seem not to require local licensing: An overt expletive may intervene between the finite verb and a negative associate subject; see the contrast between (49)b and (50)b. Hence, local licensing would seem to be restrained to associate subjects in SpecTP in Faroese I.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{13} The negative associate subject in SpecNegP is licensed by virtue of being [+negative].
In contrast to existential constructions, a negative associate subject does not cancel out the co-occurrence restriction on clause-medial overt expletives and associate subjects in TECs. Just as with non-negative associate subjects, an overt expletive must not intervene between a negative associate subject and the finite verb; see (58) and (59).

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

(59) a.  Tað hevur eingin keypt husið hjá Róa.  \textit{Fa I}
   b.  *Allarhelst hevur tað eingin keypt husið hjá Róa.
      \textit{probably has there nobody bought house-the of Roa}
This follows under the assumption that the associate subject of a TEC does not only have to leave its base position Spec\(v\)P but must be licensed in Spec\(TP\). Like a non-negative associate subject, a negative associate subject of a TEC thus has to move to Spec\(TP\), where it would have to be locally licensed.

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

The hypothesis that the associate subject of a TEC must occur in Spec\(TP\), irrespective of whether it is negative or non-negative, is corroborated by the fact that a negative associate subject does not make TECs possible in Mainland Scandinavian, where Spec\(NegP\) but not Spec\(TP\) is available. In other words, a TEC associate subject cannot be licensed in Spec\(NegP\); the sentence in (61) is ungrammatical.
(61)  *Der har ingen sagt det.  
    there has nobody said that

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

(62) a. Det ska ingen jävel slå mina barn.  
    today shall there no bastard beat my child  
    (David Håkanson, p.c., and Christer Platzack, p.c.)

b. *I dag ska det ingen jävel slå mina barn.

3.4 Summary

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

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

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

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

(63)  Der kan mange sige det. \hspace{3cm} No
there can many say that \hspace{3cm} (Falk & Torp 1900: 8)

(64)  Der maa ingen sige det. \hspace{3cm} Da
there must nobody say that \hspace{3cm} (Diderichsen 1946: 187)

(65)  Det kan ingen göra den saken bättre än han. \hspace{3cm} Sw
there can nobody do this thing better than he \hspace{3cm} (Wallin 1936: 368)

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

(66)  a. Der har ligget mange under åben himmel i nat. \hspace{3cm} Da
    b. Der har mange ligget under åben himmel i nat.
       there have many laid under open sky last night
       (Mikkelsen 1911: 29)

(67)  a. Der må da have været nogen hjemme. \hspace{3cm} Da
    b. Der må da nogen have været hjemme.
       there must really somebody have been at-home
       (Mikkelsen 1911: 29)

(68)  a. *Det har varit ingen här. \hspace{3cm} Sw
    b. Det har ingen varit här.
       there has nobody been here \hspace{3cm} (Wallin 1936: 368)
As shown in section 3.3 above, there is a special position for negative phrases to the left of a non-finite verb in Scandinavian, namely SpecNegP. Similarly, there would seem to be a special position for quantified phrases to the left of a non-finite verb, SpecQP. As shown by the example in (70) from Ljunggren (1926), a quantified object could precede or follow a non-finite verb; see also Western (1921: 221/22). Movement of a quantified object to the left of a non-finite verb, referred to as Quantifier Shift, was possible in all Scandinavian languages and still optionally applies in present-day Icelandic, (71); see Rögnvaldsson (1987), Jónsson (1996), Svenonius (2000), and Thráinsson (2007).

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

---

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

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

(72) a. Der kan ikke mange tale bedre.  
   b. *Bedre kan der ikke mange tale. 
   
   better can there not many speak  
   (Falk & Torp 1900: 10)

(73) a. Der forlanger ingen det av dig.  
   b. *Det forlanger der ingen av dig. 
   
   it demand there nobody from you  
   (Western 1921: 65)

(74) a. Der har mange ønsket det samme.  
   b. *Det samme har der mange ønsket. 
   
   the same have there many wished  
   (Western 1921: 65)

The above contrast suggests that licensing of an associate subject in SpecQP and SpecNegP has to be local: The associate subject cannot be licensed if an intervening overt expletive blocks D-feature checking by the finite verb; see (75).
Thus, the co-occurrence restriction on clause-medial overt expletives and associate subjects would seem to apply only to associate subjects in positions in which a TEC associate subject can be licensed: It applies to associate subjects in SpecTP in Faroese I, where TECs are possible with all types of subjects (see (36), (46)b and (59)b above), and to associate subjects in SpecNegP/SpecQP in former stages of Mainland Scandinavian, where TECs are restricted to negative and quantified subjects (see (72)b-(74)b above as well as (76)b and (78)b below). In contrast, in present-day Mainland Scandinavian and Faroese, where SpecNegP is not a licensing position for TEC subjects anymore, an overt expletive may intervene between the finite verb and the associate subject in SpecNegP (see section 3.3 and the examples in (50) above and (77) below). In
other words, the local licensing requirement is restricted to associate subjects in TEC subject positions.

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

(76) a. **Der** har **fire mænd** redet over broen idag.
b. *Idag har der **fire mænd** redet over broen.
c. Idag har **der** redet **fire mænd** over broen.  

*today has there ridden four men over bridge-the*  

(Falk & Torp 1900: 10)

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

(77) I dag har **der** **ingen hunde** været i haven.  

*today have there no dogs been in garden-the*

Unfortunately, I could not find an equivalent example in the traditional grammars mentioned above. But David Håkanson (p.c.), who seems to be able to license an associate subject in SpecNegP (see (62) above), just as it was possible in Mainland Scandinavian around 1900, rejects the sequence *expletive -
negative associate subject in existential constructions, supporting the above hypothesis.\textsuperscript{15}

(78) a. Det har inga hundar varit i trädgården.  
    b. *Idag har det inga hundar varit i trädgården.

\begin{quote}
today have there no dogs been in garden-the
\end{quote}

(David Håkanson, p.c.)

5 Conclusion

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

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