Full NP Object Shift: The Old Norse Puzzle and the Faroese Puzzle revisited

Höskuldur Thráinsson

This paper argues that there is no reason to believe that full NP Object Shift (NPOS) was not found in Old Norse (Old Icelandic) nor that it is more common in Modern Icelandic than in earlier stages of the language. In addition, it is claimed that NPOS is also an option in Modern Faroese, contrary to common belief, although it is much more restricted in Faroese than in Icelandic. These results demonstrate the usefulness of systematic corpus studies while at the same time reminding us of their limits. In addition, they shed a new light on the status of Faroese among the Scandinavian languages and on the nature of intra-speaker variation and grammar competition.

Keywords Faroese, grammar competition, Icelandic, intra-speaker variation, Object Shift, Old Norse, Scandinavian, treebanks

Department of Icelandic and Comparative Cultural Studies, University of Iceland, IS 101 Reykjavík, Iceland. hoski@hi.is, uni.hi.is/hoski

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the well known differences between Icelandic on the one hand and the Mainland Scandinavian languages (MSc) on the other is the fact that, in Icelandic, full NPs (or DPs) can undergo Object Shift (NPOS) whereas in MSc they cannot. This is often illustrated by sentence pairs like the following (from Icelandic (Ic) and Swedish (Sw), respectively – underline and boldface used here and elsewhere to identify the relevant constituents):[1]

(1) a. Hann keypti <u>ekki</u> **bókina** / **bókina** <u>ekki</u>.   (Ic)
     b. Han   köpte   <u>inte</u> **boken** / *__**boken**__ <u>inte</u>.   (Sw)
         he   bought not   book.DEF / book.DEF not
         'He didn't buy the book.'

In their influential work on comparative Scandinavian syntax from around 1990 onwards, Holmberg & Platzack (henceforth H&P) proposed that this difference between Icelandic and MSc should be related to different morphological properties of the two language groups:

> Essentially following Holmberg (1986) we assume this difference is a consequence of the presence or absence of Case morphology on the DP in the two types of Scandinavian languages. (H&P 1995:168, see also H&P 1991)

As explicit theoretical proposals typically do, this one led to numerous new discoveries and raised new questions, including the following:

(2) a. Why doesn't (the morphologically rich) OLD NORSE (or Old Icelandic) seem to have NPOS (see e.g. Mason 1999; Haugan 2000; Sundquist 2002)?[2]
    b. Why doesn't (the morphologically rich) MODERN FAROESE seem to have NPOS (see Barnes 1992; Vikner 1994; H&P 1995; Thráinsson 2007, 2010a; Thráinsson et al. 2012 [2004]:245–246; etc.)?

In this paper I refer to these questions as the Old Norse Puzzle and the Faroese Puzzle, respectively.

In addition, extensive research on Object Shift in Scandinavian, partly triggered by H&P's work, has shown that it is more complex than originally assumed. In particular, it has been demonstrated that Object Shift interacts with information structure (see e.g. the overviews in Thráinsson 2001:188ff., 2007:75ff.; Vikner 2005:Section 5; see also the discussion in Section 4 below and various papers in this issue). But while this discovery has led to a better understanding of the nature of Object Shift in Scandinavian, it does not in itself help solve the variation problem:

- Why is there variation within Scandinavian with respect to Object Shift, how extensive is it and what is it related to?

The purpose of this paper is to reconsider certain aspects of this variation. As the title implies, the paper mostly deals with NPOS in Old Norse and Faroese and disregards pronominal Object Shift (PronOS) for the most part. In the process it will be necessary to discuss NPOS in different stages of Icelandic. The main descriptive claims of the paper are the following:

(3) a. There is no reason to believe that the restrictions on NPOS in Old Norse, or other earlier stages of Icelandic, were any different from those of Modern Icelandic.
    b. Contrary to standard claims in the literature, NPOS is not completely excluded in Faroese, although not as generally accepted as in Icelandic.

In the process of arguing for these claims, the questions in (2) will be answered. As will be shown, a key element in these questions is the word SEEM.

The organization of the paper is as follows: In Section 2, I briefly describe the kinds of NPOS that I will be considering. In Section 3, I review the basis for the commonly accepted claim that NPOS is not found in Old Norse, and then show that NPOS appears to be just as infrequent in modern Icelandic texts as it is in Old Norse and other older Icelandic texts. Hence, we cannot conclude that NPOS was not an option in Old Norse although examples of it are hard to come

by in texts. In Section 4, I consider some examples of shifted and non-shifted NP objects from (modern) Icelandic texts and show that they are typically consistent with the claim that that shifted objects will have a reading that has been described as strong/specific/defocused/etc. whereas non-shifted NPs can either have a strong or a weak reading (see also Thráinsson 2001:193; 2007:79).[3] In Section 5, I demonstrate that if we take the discourse conditions on NPOS seriously and present speakers of Faroese with sentences containing NPOS in the appropriate context, they often accept at least some of these. Finally, Section 6 relates the observed facts to general issues concerning inter-speaker and intra-speaker variation in syntax and the status of Faroese among the Scandinavian languages.

2. THE KINDS OF OBJECT SHIFT CONSIDERED

The typical Object Shift examples discussed in the literature involve a simple sentence with an object preceding the negation (see (1) above) or some (other) adverb that typically precedes the VP and cannot follow it. Thus, the adverb *aldrei* 'never' is often used to illustrate Object Shift in Icelandic since it typically precedes the VP and does not follow it:

(4) a. Ég hef <u>aldrei</u> **[**lesið bókina].
  I have never read book.DEF
  'I have never read the book.'

  b. *Ég hef [lesið bókina] <u>aldrei</u>.
  I have read book.DEF never

  c. Ég las **bókina** <u>aldrei</u>.
  I read book.DEF never
  'I never read the book.'

The standard assumption is that in examples like (4c) the finite verb has moved out of the VP and the object has shifted across the adverb *aldrei*, since this adverb must in general precede the VP, as shown in (4b). Since the same is not true of the adverb *oft* 'often, frequently', as shown in (5b), examples like (5c) cannot be used as a reliable demonstration of Object Shift:

(5) a. Ég hef <u>oft</u> **[**lesið bókina].
  I have often read book.DEF
  'I have often read the book.'

  b. Ég hef [lesið bókina] <u>oft</u>.
  I have read book.DEF often
  'I have read the book often.'

  c. Ég las **bókina** <u>oft</u>.
  I read book.DEF often
  'I read the book often.'

In (5c), the object may have shifted out of the VP and across the medial adverb *oft*, but an alternative analysis would be that the adverb *oft* follows the VP, as it does in (5b), and the object is in situ inside the VP.

In addition to simple examples of this kind, Holmberg (1986:222–223) demonstrated that the so-called 'Raising to Object' (or Exceptional Case Marking (ECM) or Accusative with Infinitive (AcI)) in Scandinavian obeys the same restrictions as Object Shift and hence arguably 'is' Object Shift. His examples include the following (his judgments):

(6) a. Dom anser   **honom** <u>alla</u> vara   dum.   (Sw)
         they consider   him.ACC   all   be.INF stupid
         'They all believe him to be stupid.'
     b. *Dom anser   **Gunnar** <u>alla</u> vara   dum.
         they   consider Gunnar   all   be INF stupid
     c. Dom anser   <u>alla</u> **honom/Gunnar** vara   dum.
         they   believe all   him.ACC/Gunnar be.INF stupid

(7) a. Dom känner **honom** <u>alla</u>.   (Sw)
         they   know   him.ACC   all
         'They all know him.'
     b. *Dom känner **Gunnar** <u>alla</u>.
         they   know   Gunnar   all
     c. Dom känner <u>alla</u> (?)**honom/Gunnar**.
         they   know   all   him.ACC /Gunnar

(8) a. Þeir telja   **hann**   <u>allir</u>   vera   heimskan.   (Ic)
         they consider him.ACC all.NOM be.INF stupid.ACC
         'They all believe him to be stupid.'
     b. Þeir telja   **Harald**   <u>allir</u>   vera   heimskan.
         they consider Harold.ACC all.NOM be.INF stupid.ACC
         'They all believe Harold to be stupid.'
     c. Þeir telja   <u>allir</u>   ??**hann/Harald**   vera   heimskan.
         they consider all.NOM   him.ACC /Harold.ACC be.INF stupid.ACC

(9) a. Þeir þekkja **hann**   <u>allir</u>.   (Ic)
         they know   him.ACC   all.NOM
         'They all know him.'
     b. Þeir þekkja **Harald**   <u>allir</u>.
         they know   Harold.ACC all.NOM
         'They all know Harold.'
     c. Þeir þekkja <u>allir</u>   ***hann/Harald**.
         they know   all.NOM   him.ACC/Harold.ACC

These examples are meant to show that the acceptability pattern we get for Swedish in the AcI construction in (6) parallels the pattern observed for simple Object Shift structures: In Swedish it is possible to shift pronouns but not full NPs around the

quantifier *alla* 'all' whereas both full NPs and pronouns (stressed or unstressed) can be left in situ in these constructions (see (6c) and (7c)). In Icelandic, on the other hand, it is possible to shift pronouns and full NPs around the quantifier in both constructions but an unstressed pronoun cannot be left behind.[4]

This pattern also extends to constructions with causative verbs and perception verbs, as in Vikner (2005:Section 3.3); the following examples are based on his examples and his judgments (Da = Danish):

(10) a. Pétur sá **þá** áreiðanlega vinna Hauka. (Ic)
   Peter saw them.ACC undoubtedly beat.INF Haukar.ACC
   'Peter undoubtedly saw them beat Haukar.'

  b. Pétur sá **Val** áreiðanlega vinna Hauka.
   Peter saw Valur.ACC undoubtedly beat.INF Haukar.ACC
   'Peter undoubtedly saw Valur beat Haukar.'

  c. Pétur sá áreiðanlega *þá/Val vinna Hauka.
   Peter saw undoubtedly them.ACC/Valur.ACC beat.INF Haukar.ACC

(11) a. Peter så **dem** formentlig slå FC København. (Da)
   Peter saw them.ACC presumably beat.INF FC København
   'Peter presumably saw them beat FC København.'

  b. *Peter så **AGF** formentlig slå FC København.
   Peter saw AGF presumably beat.INF FC København

  c. Peter så formentlig *dem/AGF slå FC København.
   Peter saw presumably them.ACC/AGF beat.INF FC Copenhagen

Again, we get the pattern typical for Object Shift in the two languages: In Icelandic it is possible to shift either a pronoun or a full NP across the adverb *áreiðanlega* 'undoubtedly' (examples (10a, b)) whereas only the full NP and not the unstressed pronoun can be left in situ (example (10c)). In Danish, on the other hand, only the unstressed pronoun can shift across the adverb *formentlig* 'presumably' (examples (11a,b)) and only a full NP and not an unstressed pronoun can be left in situ (example (11c)).[5]

Given this, I will also consider examples of Object Shift in constructions of this kind (i.e. sentences containing infinitives after verbs of saying, believing, perception verbs and causative verbs) in the discussion below. When necessary, I will refer to examples of this sort as 'complex Object Shift' (or complex NPOS) as opposed to simple Object Shift examples.

3. NPOS IN OLD NORSE AND (OLDER) ICELANDIC TEXTS

3.1 NPOS in Old Norse

In her study of Object Shift in Old Norse (ON), Mason (1999) found one apparent example of NPOS in a corpus of nine Old Norse sagas (here taken from Sundquist 2002:332):[6]

(12) at   hann gefi **þeim manni** aldri fríun, er   myrðan hefir . . . (ON)
     that he   give that man   never peace that murdered has . . .
     'that he would never give peace to the man who has murdered . . .'

Sundquist maintains (ibid.) that this example does 'not provide evidence for a full
DP Object Shift like in modern Icelandic'. The reason is that Object Shift in double
object constructions of this kind is also found in 'Norwegian [No] and some varieties
of Swedish', according to H&P (1995:172; see also Sundquist 2002:332–333):[7]

(13) a. De   ga   **Marit** ikke blomstene.   (No)
        they gave Marit not flowers.DEF
        'They didn't give Mary the flowers.'
     b. Vi ger **barnen**   alltid   vad de   vill ha. (Sw)
        we give children.DEF always what they want have
        'We always give the children what they want.'

In his study of Old Norse word order and information structure, Haugan
(2000:Section 4.3) looked for instances of NPOS in his corpus and concluded:

> I have not been able to find Old Norse examples with <u>both</u> a sentence
> adverbial and a shifted (full) NP, which might be due to my searching
> method.

Based on this, and on his own research, Sundquist (2002:333) concludes:

> Thus, other analyses of Old Norse agree with the results here: full DP Object
> Shift is not an option in earlier stages of Mainland Scandinavian.

Thanks to recent developments in corpus linguistics we know, however, that this
conclusion is not warranted, at least not with respect to Old Norse (Old Icelandic).
Among the corpora established by the project Mörkuð íslensk málheild [A Tagged
Corpus of Icelandic] (http://mim.hi.is) is a corpus of 1,659,285 words, based on the
text of 44 Icelandic sagas, most of them probably written in the 14th and 15th century.
Using this corpus, Rögnvaldsson & Helgadóttir (2011) found (at least) nine examples
of clear instances of NPOS in Old Icelandic, including the following (examples (6a,
b) in their paper):

(14) a. Nú   leita þeir um   skóginn   og   finna **Gísla**   eigi
        now search they through forest.DEF and find   Gísli.ACC not
        'Now they search through the forest and do not find Gísli'
     b. er   hann dræpi **Þórð**   eigi og   förunauta   hans
        that he   killed Thord.ACC not and companions his
        'that he didn't kill Thord and his companions'

As Rögnvaldsson & Helgadóttir point out, it is unlikely that the nine examples they
found are the only ones present in the corpus (a completely exhaustive search of

this kind is notoriously difficult in a tagged corpus). As mentioned in Section 2 above, one could also look for complex NPOS in the corpus, such as examples involving causatives or similar infinitival constructions. Then one finds examples like this one:

(15) en [hann] lét **Eið**   þó   ráða.
       but he   let Eidur.ACC nevertheless decide.INF
       'but (he) nevertheless let Eidur decide.'

I have not searched the corpus extensively for examples of this kind, since the actual frequency is not crucial for my purposes, but even if a few additional ones can be found, the following question obviously arises:[8]

- Aren't nine unambiguous examples of simple NPOS in 44 Icelandic sagas (a corpus of over 1.6 million words) just a negligible number, even if we can find a few additional examples of complex NPOS?

The most straightforward way of answering this question is to compare the frequency of NPOS in texts from different periods in the history of Icelandic, including Old Icelandic (Old Norse) and the modern language. As will be shown in the next section, NPOS is very rare in written texts throughout, even in texts from the 21st century, where there is no question that NPOS is 'an option'.

3.2 NPOS in the history of Icelandic

The Icelandic Parsed Historical Corpus (IcePaHC; http://www.linguist.is/ icelandic_treebank) is an excellent research tool for the kind of comparison necessary here. It contains approximately 100,000 word text samples from 10 centuries, i.e. from the 12th to the 21st century, and thus a total of roughly one million words. The text samples from the different periods are as comparable as possible with respect to genre. The original goal was that they would contain about 80,000 words from narrative texts plus approximately 20,000 words from religious texts. The researchers came quite close to this, although the exact proportions inevitably vary somewhat as shown in Table 1 below (see Rögnvaldsson et al. 2011: 144).

The annotation and parsing of this corpus makes it possible to do very specific searches. Since previous searches for NPOS in Old Norse had typically looked for objects preceding the negation or the adverb *aldrei* 'never', I decided to do a comparable search in the IcePaHC corpus. The results are shown in Table 2 below, grouped by centuries.[9]

The six examples found in the search are shown in (16) (the sources are listed as in IcePaHC).

C	narr	rel	biogr	sci	law	Total
12th	0	40871	0	4439	0	45310
13th	93463	21196	0	0	6183	120842
14th	77370	21315	0	0	0	98685
15th	111560	0	0	0	0	111560
16th	35733	60464	0	0	0	96197
17th	46281	28134	52997	0	0	127412
18th	63322	22963	22099	0	0	108384
19th	100362	20370	0	3268	0	124000
20th	103921	21234	0	0	0	125155
21th	43102	0	0	0	0	43102
Total	675114	236547	75096	7707	6183	1000647

C = century, narr = narrative texts, rel = religious texts, biogr = biographies, sci = scientific texts

Table 1. An overview of the text types in IcePaHC.

Century	12th	13th	14th	15th	16th	17th	18th	19th	20th	21st	Total
NPOS found:	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	0	6

Table 2. The number of NPOS examples in IcePaHC involving the negation or the adverb 'never'.

(16) a. Þeir finna **Guð** aldregi. (Homilies, 1150)
  they find God.ACC never
  'They never find God.'

 b. honum gekk **Ketilríður** aldrei úr hug[10] (Vigl., 1400)
  him.DAT went Ketilridur.NOM never from mind
  'he never forgot Ketilridur'

 c. úr því sá ég **Níels** ... aldrei meir (Indíafari, 1661)
  from that saw I Niels.ACC never again
  'I never saw Niels again after that'

 d. elskum vér **Guð** ekki fullkomlega sem skyldum (Gerhard, 1630)
  love we God.ACC not completely as should
  'we do not love God completely as we should'

 e. [þær] fóru **Guðmundi** ekki sem best (Piltur, 1850)
  they suited Gudmundur.DAT not as best
  'they didn't completely suit Gudmundur'

 f. ég sá **þessa menn** ekki aftur (Margsaga 1985)
  I saw these men.ACC not again
  'I didn't see these men again'

The obvious conclusion is that NPOS is in fact EXTREMELY RARE IN WRITTEN TEXTS throughout the history of Icelandic, even in modern Icelandic texts.[11] Since we know that NPOS is grammatical in 20th- and 21st-century Icelandic, the fact that only a handful of NPOS examples can be found in Old Norse corpora cannot be used as an argument for the conclusion that NPOS was 'not an option' in Old Norse, as Sundquist (2002:333) maintains.[12]

4. READINGS OF SHIFTED AND NON-SHIFTED OBJECTS IN ICELANDIC

We can now argue that we have managed to get rid of the Old Norse Puzzle (recall (2a) above): It was only apparent – it is not the case that NPOS cannot be found in Old Norse. It is just very infrequent in Old Norse texts, just as it is in more recent and modern Icelandic texts. But in the process of eliminating the Old Norse Puzzle, it looks like we have created a new one:

- If it is the case that NPOS has a special discourse function related to information structure, such as fronting defocused objects (or objects with a 'strong' or 'specific' or 'old information' reading, see below), how can it be so infrequent in texts?

The extent to which this is a real puzzle depends on how the hypothesis about the discourse (or information structure) properties of NPOS is formulated. Two versions are given in (17):

(17) *The Information Structure Hypothesis*[13]
    Strong version: All and only objects that have a DEFINITE/SPECIFIC/STRONG/ DEFOCUSED/OLD INFORMATION/etc. reading must shift (if syntactically possible).[14]
    Weak version: Only objects that have a DEFINITE/SPECIFIC/STRONG/ DEFOCUSED/OLD/etc. information reading may shift.

Various formulations of the relevant contrasts and the formal implementation can be found in the literature (see e.g. de Hoop 1990, 1992; Diesing & Jelinek 1993, 1995; Diesing 1996, 1997; Vikner 1997, 2001, 2005; Engels & Vikner 2007; Andréasson 2010; etc.). Some of these will be discussed later in this section. But regardless of the exact formulation it should be clear that if objects with the appropriate reading obligatorily have to shift (the strong variant of the Information Structure Hypothesis in (17)), then we would expect to find more examples of NPOS in texts. If, on the other hand, this shift is not obligatory but optional, i.e. if it is the case that NP objects with the relevant reading do not HAVE TO shift but CAN do so (the weak variant of the hypothesis), then the observed infrequency of NPOS could be explained: Objects with the appropriate reading do not necessarily show up as NPOS examples because they can also remain in situ. But if that is true, then we should be able to FIND examples of such objects in situ in Icelandic texts. The next task is, then, to look more closely at examples of shifted and non-shifted objects in Icelandic texts and study their reading.

For this purpose I used another subcorpus of the Tagged Corpus of Icelandic project mentioned above. This subcorpus was originally created for the purposes of making an Icelandic frequency dictionary (*Íslensk orðtíðnibók* 1991). This is a tagged

corpus of some 500,000 words from 100 texts of different genres from 1980–1989, approximately 5000 words from each.[15] A search for NPOS in this corpus yielded the following five examples of a full NP object preceding the negation or the adverb *aldrei* 'never' (and some 18 corresponding ones with the order Adverb–Object, i.e. with the object in situ):

(18) a. Fleira gerðist   nú   ekki og ég sá **þessa menn** <u>ekki</u> aftur
       more   happened now   not and I saw these men.ACC not   again
       'Nothing more happened and I didn't see these men again.'

   b. rík   tilhneiging hjá   dómstólum að rífa **börn**   <u>ekki</u> úr . . .
       rich tendency   with courts   to tear children.ACC not   from
       '(there is) rich tendency in the courts not to remove children from . . . '

   c. Gerlach taldi   **Íslendingum** <u>ekki</u> alls   varnað
       Gerlach believed Icelanders.DAT not of.everything prevented
       'Gerlach didn't believe that Icelanders were no good.'

   d. En Týri lét **þessi ummæli**   <u>ekki</u> spilla   gleði   sinni
       but Tyri let these remarks.ACC not spoil.INF gladness his.REFL
       'But Tyri didn't let these remarks spoil his happiness'

   e. En það   kom   aldrei neinn.
       but there came never anybody
       'But nobody ever came.

       Bergbúarnir   sóttu **matinn**   <u>aldrei</u> fyrr en hún . . .
       cliff-dwellers.DEF fetched food.DEF never until   she
       'The cliff-dwellers never fetched the food until she . . . '

As can be seen, some of these examples are instances of simple NPOS, others of the complex variety (examples (18c, d)). In general, the reading of the shifted objects can be said to be compatible with the Information Structure Hypothesis as outlined in (17). Note, for instance that the indefinite NPs in examples (18b, c) have a generic reading and it has been pointed out before that such NPs can shift in Icelandic (see e.g. Diesing & Jelinek 1993:23–24; Thráinsson 2001:190; see also Collins & Thráinsson 1996).

Conversely, many of the non-shifted objects in this corpus arguably have a different reading (focus, new information, etc.), such as the following, for instance:

(19) a. Ég sá <u>ekki</u> **eyrun**.
       I saw not ears.DEF
       'I didn't see the ears.'

   b. Passaðu bara að týna <u>ekki</u> **húslyklinum**.
       take.care just to lose not   housekey.DEF
       'Just take care not to lose the housekey.'

   c. Þeir þoldu <u>ekki</u> **spennuna**.
       they stood not pressure.DEF
       'They couldn't stand the pressure.'

    d. [ég] hata allt kerfi   þjóðfélagsins . . . ég les   aldrei **blöðin**.
      I   *hate all* *system society.GEN*.DEF   *I*   *read never papers*.DEF
      'I hate the whole social system . . . I never read the papers.'

Note that although all of these non-shifted objects are formally definite, the suffixed article does not imply that they have been mentioned before in the discourse (i.e. that they are old information in that sense) – and they had not been. These examples could then be said to be compatible with either the weak or the strong version of the Information Structure Hypothesis in (17) above. But now consider the following examples:

(20) a. **framlengja** frestinn   en [þeir] . . . virða   ekki **framlenginguna**
      extend   *deadline*.DEF *but they*   *respect not* *extension*.DEF
      'extend the deadline, but they do not respect the extension'

    b. eignast annað   [**barn**] . . . Nei. Ég læt ekki **barnið**   **mitt** frá   mér
      have   *another child*   *no I* *give not* *child*.DEF *my* *from me*
      'have another child. No. I am not giving my child away'

    c. á sama hátt og **Guð**. Við sjáum ekki **Guð** af því að . . .
      in same way as God we *see*   *not God because*
      'the same way as God. We do not see God because . . .'

Here it would seem that all the non-shifted objects represent old information (see the preceding boldfaced items). While this is unexpected under the strong version of the Information Structure Hypothesis, facts of this sort have been pointed out before. Consider the following sets of examples (see e.g. Thráinsson 2001:193, 2007:78–79, and references cited there; the examples are partly based on work by Diesing 1996 and later, and Vikner 1997 and later):

(21) a. Ég las   **þrjár bækur** ekki.
      I   *read three books* *not*
      'There are three (specific) books that I didn't read.'

    b. Þau sýna **viðtöl**   **við Obama** alltaf   klukkan 11.
      they show interviews with Obama always clock 11
      'Whenever there are interviews with Obama they are shown at 11 o'clock.'

(22) a. Ég las   ekki **þrjár bækur**.
      I   *read not* *three books*
      'It is not true that I read three books'/
      'There are three (specific) books that I didn't read.'

    b. Þau sýna alltaf **viðtöl**   **við Obama** klukkan 11.
      they show always interviews with Obama clock 11
      'It is always the case that they show interviews with Obama at 11 o'clock.'/
      'Whenever ther are interviews with Obama, they are shown at 11 o'clock.'

As shown by the idiomatic translations here, the shifted objects in (21) only have the strong or specific reading whereas the non-shifted ones in (22) are ambiguous. This is

obviously compatible with the weak version of the Information Structure Hypothesis in (17) but not the strong one.[16]

Having eliminated the Old Norse Puzzle and explained, to some extent at least, why NPOS can be so infrequent despite interacting with information structure, we can now turn to the Faroese Puzzle mentioned in (2b) above.

5. NPOS IN FAROESE

As mentioned in (2b), it has standardly been assumed, at least since Barnes (1992), that NPOS is ungrammatical in Faroese. Since I will challenge this assumption below, it is necessary to give an overview of the evidence and consider some of the explanations that have been proposed to account for this apparent fact.

5.1 The evidence against NPOS in Faroese

First, it has been reported in several papers and books that NPOS is ungrammatical in Faroese (Fa). The examples provided include the following:

(23) a. Jógvan keypti <u>ikki</u> **bókina**.
          Jogvan bought not   book.DEF
          'Jogvan didn't buy the book.'

      b. *Jógvan keypti **bókina**   <u>ikki</u>.   (Barnes 1992:28)
          Jogvan bought book.DEF not

(24) a. Jógvan kennir <u>ikki</u> **Siggu**.
          Jogvan knows not   Sigga.ACC
          'Jogvan doesn't know Sigga.'

      b. *Jógvan kennir **Siggu**   <u>ikki</u>.   (H&P 1995:172)
          Jogvan knows Sigga.ACC not

(25) a. Zakaris hjálpti <u>aldri</u> **Hjalmari**.
          Zakaris helped never Hjalmar.DAT

      b. ?*Zakaris hjálpti **Hjalmari** <u>aldri</u>.   (Thráinsson et al. 2012:245)
          Zakaris helped Hjalmar.DAT never

As shown here, these researchers all agree that the NPOS-variants (the (b)-versions of the sentences) are ungrammatical. The above judgments presented by Barnes and by H&P must be those of their informants, whereas the judgments presented by Thráinsson et al. reflect the intuition of the three Faroese co-authors of the book.

These judgments were by and large confirmed in a pilot study of variation in Faroese syntax conducted by Höskuldur Thráinsson, Jóhannes Gísli Jónsson and Thórhallur Eythórsson in 2006. After an introduction explaining the purpose of the study (e.g. that this was a survey of variation in spoken language and not any kind of a test and that the subjects should base their judgments on their own intuition and not on something they might have been taught in school), the subjects were presented with a number of examples and asked to evaluate them. The most common form

		Ja	?	Nei	Viðmerkingar
F4	Tað hevur eitt par dansað í garðinum.				

<p align="center">Table 3. The form of the questionnaire in a Faroese pilot study.</p>

of the presentation is shown in Table 3 (other forms included choice between two alternative variants). The subjects were asked to check one of the three boxes (the one labeled in the table 'Viðmerkingar' was for comments) and the choices were defined as indicated in (26) (see Thráinsson 2009, 2010a):

(26) *Definition of the possible choices in the Faroese pilot study questionnaire 2006*
    ja 'yes': 'Common/possible sentence. I could easily have said this.'[17]
    ?: 'Doubtful sentence. I would hardly say this.'
    nei 'no': 'Impossible sentence. I would not have said this.'

Some results from this questionnaire are shown in Table 4. In this table and in some other tables below, the highest or most notable numbers are in boldface.[18]

Number	Example	Yes	?	No	=	N
a. F001	Jens hjálpti <u>aldri</u> **Zakaris**.					
	Jens helped never Zakaris.DAT	**87.1**	2.9	10.0	100%	240
b. F002	Jens hjálpti **Zakaris** <u>aldri</u>.					229
	Jens helped Zakaris.DAT never	5.3	8.7	**86.0**	100%	
c. F121	Hann át <u>ikki</u> **matpakkan**.					
	he ate not lunch-pack.DEF	**94.3**	1.6	4.1	100%	243
d. F038	Hann drakk **mjólkina** <u>ikki</u>.					
	he drank milk.DEF not	2.9	5.9	**91.2**	100%	239
e. F048	Zakaris hjálpti **honum** <u>ongantíð</u>.					
	Zakaris helped him.DAT never	**91.8**	3.7	4.5	100%	242

<p align="center">Table 4. Judgments of shifted and non-shifted objects in a Faroese pilot study.</p>

As pointed out above, the standard assumptions about the ungrammaticality of NPOS in Faroese seem to be confirmed by the results shown in this table: 87% of the subjects found the non-shifted example in *a* to be natural (or 'common') and 86% rejected the corresponding shifted version in *b*. The results are very much the same for the pair represented by *c* and *d*: Over 90% accept the non-shifted version (example *c*) and reject the shifted version (example *d*). Conversely, over 90% of the subjects accept the PronOS example *e*.

There would thus seem to be very little reason to question the standard claim that NPOS is ungrammatical in Faroese. Since Faroese syntax is in general not that different from Icelandic syntax, not even with respect to the famous V-to-I (or V-to-T) movement (see e.g. Angantýsson 2011:81ff.; Heycock et al. 2012; and references

cited there), linguists have looked for explanations of this. In the next subsection I will review two of these and show that they do not work.

5.2 Two attempts to explain the Faroese Puzzle

As already mentioned, H&P (1995) suggested that the availability of NPOS depended on rich (strong) case morphology. Icelandic has the proper kind of case morphology (m-case) but, despite its outward appearance, Faroese has a weak(er) m-case 'which does not suffice to provide a DP with inherent Case value (in the sense discussed)' (H&P 1995:173). H&P provide two arguments for this claim.

The first argument has to do with the lack of case preservation in the Faroese passive (see also Thráinsson et al. 2012:266ff.). Here there is a clear contrast between passives of verbs like *hjálpa* 'help' in Icelandic and Faroese, as illustrated below:

(27) a. Þau hjálpuðu **honum**.   (Ic)
       they helped   him.DAT
       'They helped him.'

   b. **Honum** var hjálpað.   / ***Hann**   varð hjálpaður.
       him.DAT was helped.N.SG / he.NOM was helped.M.SG
       'He was helped.'

(28) a. Tey hjálptu **honum**.   (Fa)
       they helped him.DAT
       'They helped him.'

   b. ***Honum** varð hjálpt.   / **Hann**   varð hjálptur.
       him.DAT was helped.N.SG / he.NOM was helped.M.SG
       'He was helped.'

The verb *hjálpa* 'help' takes a dative case object in Icelandic and Faroese (seen in (27a), (28a)). In Icelandic this case is preserved in the passive and hence the subject does not trigger agreement, witness the fact that the past participle shows up in the default neuter singular in the passive although the subject is masculine (see (27b)). In Faroese, on the other hand, the dative object case of *hjálpa* is not preserved in the passive: The passive subject shows up in the nominative and triggers agreement (see (28b)).

While this is an intriguing and not very well understood difference between Icelandic and Faroese, it can hardly be attributed to some systematic property of Faroese m-case since object case is in fact preserved in the passive of a number of Faroese verbs. This includes the common verbs *takka* 'thank' and *trúgva* 'believe', as shown in (29)–(30) (see also Thráinsson et al. 2012:267; Thráinsson 2009:4):

(29) a. Tey takkaðu **honum**.
       they thanked him.DAT
       'They thanked him.'

    b. **Honum** varð takkað.   / ***Hann** varð takkaður.
       him.DAT was thanked.N.SG / he.NOM was thanked.M.SG
       'He was thanked.'

(30) a. Tey trúðu   **henni** ongantíð.
       they believed her.DAT never
       'They never believed her.'

    b. **Henni** varð ongantíð trúð.   / ***Hon**   varð ongantíð trúð.
       her.DAT was never believed / she.NOM was never believed
       'She was never believed.'

While this lexical variation is obviously a puzzle in itself, it cannot really be used as a demonstration of some general property of the Faroese case system.[19]

    The second argument that H&P (1995) present for the proposed 'weakness' of the Faroese case system has to do with ECM constructions (or 'Accusative with Infinitive', AcI). Here, too, H&P claim that there is a clear contrast between Icelandic and Faroese, and give examples like the following to illustrate this (H&P 1995:173):

(31) a. **Mér** líkar mjólkin.   (Ic)
       me.DAT likes milk.DEF.NOM
       'I like the milk.'

    b. Hann telur   **mér** líka   mjólkin.
       he believes me.DAT like.INF milk.DEF.NOM
       'He believes that I like the milk.' [lit. 'believes me to like']

(32) a. **Mær** dámar mjólkina.   (Fa)
       me.DAT likes milk.DEF.ACC
       'I like the milk.'

    b. Hann heldur   **meg** dáma   mjólkina.
       he believes me.ACC like.INF milk.DEF.ACC
       'He believes that I like the milk.' [lit. 'believes me to like']

Holmberg & Platzack point out that whereas Icelandic 'preserves' the dative subject case *mér* 'me' in the ECM construction (31b), Faroese apparently does not in the corresponding (32b), where the case of the subject is accusative instead of the expected dative.

    As pointed out by Thráinsson (2009:4–5), this argument does not stand up to scrutiny. The reason is the following: Many speakers allow either nominative or dative subjects with *dáma* 'like' and some other verbs. For such speakers we get the following paradigm:

(33) a. **Mær** dámar / **Eg**   dámi mjólkina.
       me.DAT like / I.NOM like milk.DEF.ACC
       'I like the milk.'

    b. Hann heldur   **mær** / **meg** dáma   mjólkina.
       he believes me.DAT me.ACC like.INF milk.DEF.ACC
       'He believes that I like the milk.' [lit. 'he believes me to like']

As (33b) shows, these speakers can either get a (preserved) dative subject in the ECM construction with *dáma* 'like' or else an accusative subject corresponding to the nominative subject in (33a). To put it differently: What H&P believed was a non-preservation of case in the ECM construction with *dáma* 'like' was in fact a normal ECM (or AcI) construction where an accusative subject of the infinitive corresponds to a nominative subject of the finite form of the verb. This account of the apparent non-preservation of case in the ECM construction predicts that if a given verb exclusively takes a dative subject in its finite form, then only dative will be possible in the ECM construction. There are not very many such verbs left in modern Faroese but *hóva* 'like' is one of them. As shown in (34), this prediction is borne out (judgments elicited from six native speakers of Faroese by e-mail):

(34) a. **Mær**   hóvar / ***Eg**   hóvi hetta best.
　　　　me.DAT like / I.NOM like this best
　　　　'I like this best.'

　　b. Hann heldur **mær** / ***meg** hóva   hetta best.
　　　　he   believes me.DAT / me.ACC like.INF this best
　　　　'He believes that I like this best.' [lit.: 'he believes me to like']

Thus, we can conclude that there is no independent evidence for H&P's hypothesis of 'weak m-case' in Faroese. Hence, we must look elsewhere for an explanation of the Faroese Puzzle.

　　Erteschik-Shir (2005, abbreviated to E-S in this section) has made a very different proposal to explain the Faroese Puzzle. According to her, Object Shift is essentially phonological in nature. She maintains that there is a crucial difference between the Icelandic and the Faroese stress and intonation system and that this is the reason why NPOS is acceptable in Icelandic but not in Faroese (E-S:78–80).

　　The first part of her account goes like this: In PronOS, the weak pronoun typically 'prosodically incorporates' into the verb, hence can (or must) precede the adverb.[20] In Icelandic constructions with a full NP object and an adverb, 'the negative adverb and the object form a prosodic unit in both orders', i.e. either as Obj–Adv (shifted) or Adv–Obj (unshifted). After this prosodic incorporation, the stress pattern will be as follows (E-S:79, see her example (64)):

(35) a. Jón las   ˈbókina +ˌekki.
　　　　Jon read book.DEF not
　　　　'John didn't read the book.'

　　b. Jón las   ˈekki +ˌbókina.
　　　　Jon read not   book.DEF
　　　　'John didn't read the book.'

She then presents two intonation diagrams, based on recordings, to support this claim.

　　The problem with this part of the argument is that while (35a) is a reasonable description of the way examples of this kind are pronounced in Icelandic (i.e., the

negation is arguably 'prosodically incorporated' into the preceding object), (35b) (and the pronunciation illustrated by the corresponding diagram in E-S's paper) is not at all the normal way of pronouncing this kind of example.[21] It is much more natural to prosodically incorporate the negation into the preceding verb, which would give something like (36) in E-S's notation, where the verb and the adverb form a prosodic unit (as in Danish, according to E-S), not the adverb and the object:[22]

(36) Jón ˈlas + ˌekki bókina.

Now it might seem that this inaccuracy about the stress and intonation pattern of unshifted constructions in Icelandic cannot really be crucial here since it is the acceptability of the shifted variants (i.e. NPOS) in Icelandic and their unacceptability in Faroese (and other Scandinavian languages) which is the main issue. This is where the second part of E-S's account comes in and it goes as follows: 'Having initial stress [like Icelandic – and Faroese for the most part] might enable a language to tolerate a longer sequence of syllables without primary stress ... thus allowing for longer prosodically incorporated strings' (E-S:79). Hence, prosodic incorporation of full NPs and adverbs in NPOS is possible in Icelandic. But it might not be possible in Faroese because in Faroese there is, according to E-S, a productive rule of stress shift onto the second element of the compound, witness the stress pattern of certain compounds borrowed from Danish (E-S cites Árnason 1996 on this).

The problem here is that this characterization of the Faroese stress and intonation system is not accurate. Although Faroese is somewhat more 'liberal' in its stress pattern than Icelandic, the basic rules are the same, namely the following:

- *The stress alternation rule*
  Initial stress with some stress on odd numbered syllables (Árnason 2011:90; Thráinsson et al. 2012:28)
- *The compound stress rule*
  Secondary stress on the second part of a compound noun (Lockwood 1977:8; Árnason 2011:275 ff.; Thráinsson et al. 2012:28)

Sometimes these rules clash and then it may vary which one wins out. Faroese is much more liberal than Icelandic in preserving foreign stress patterns in loanwords (see Thráinsson et al. 2012:29–30), although it sometimes 'chooses its own pattern' (Árnason 2011:281). But there is no evidence for the claim that there is a productive rule that shifts the main stress onto the second element of native compounds. Faroese allows a large number of stress patterns in native compounds but the general rule is that these have initial main stress. This is illustrated in Table 5 below (where 3 = primary stress, 2 = secondary stress, 1 = no stress, see Thráinsson et al. 2012:28).

Compounding is productive, of course, and given the large number of permissible stress patterns in Faroese compounds illustrated in Table 5 it is not likely that prosodic

Types of elements combined	Stress pattern	Example
bisyllabic + monosyllabic	3–1–2	*meitil+berg* 'steep rock wall'
bisyllabic + bisyllabic	3–1–2–1	*grinda+hvalur* 'pilot whale'
bisyllabic + trisyllabic	3–1–2–1	*meitil+berginum* 'the steep rock wall(DAT)'
monosyllabic + monosyllabic	3–2	*Ís + land* 'Iceland'
monosyllabic + bisyllabic	3–2–1	*ís + lendskur* 'Icelandic'
trisyllabic + monosyllabic	3–1–1–2	*kjallara + dyr* 'cellar door'
trisyllabic + bisyllabic	3–1–1–2–1	*kjallara + búgvi* 'cellar dweller'

Table 5. Stress patterns in Faroese compounds.

incorporation of the NP and the following adverb in NPOS structures 'would be unpronounceable' in Faroese, as suggested by E-S (page 80). They obviously are not unpronounceable in Icelandic, where the compound stress patterns are very similar.

We can thus conclude that neither of the two proposals reviewed here explains the apparent ungrammaticality of NPOS in Faroese. This suggests that the time might be ripe to reconsider the Faroese Puzzle. We will do that in the next subsection.

5.3 Looking at the Faroese Puzzle from a different perspective

Reconsidering the evidence presented for the ungrammaticality of NPOS in Faroese in Section 5.1 above, we can make two observations:

- All the examples judged by native speakers were presented 'out of the blue', i.e. none of them included any kind of appropriate context.
- No examples of complex NPOS (see Section 2 above) were included.

Since it has been demonstrated that context and the information structure of sentences are highly relevant for Object Shift, the first point made here is rather unfortunate. And although the conditions for complex NPOS (Object Shift in sentences containing ECM infinitives or infinitival complements of causative verbs or perception verbs) are generally considered to be identical to those of simple NPOS, the complex variants should obviously be tested in Faroese for the sake of completeness. Hence, this section reports on the results of a new empirical study of NPOS in Faroese where the subjects were presented with simple and complex NPOS examples in varying contexts.

In this study the subjects were asked to judge sentences in a written questionnaire.[23] The general instructions were similar to those described for the Faroese pilot study in Section 5.1 above but this time the examples to be judged included a context sentence as shown in Table 6 below. It was explained to the subjects that they should only judge the second part of the example and that the

		Ja	?	Nei	Viðmerkingar
Y1073	*Kristina Háfoss hevrði gjørt eitt gott arbeiði.*				
	Henni bleiv altíð róst.				

Table 6. The form of the questionnaire in a Faroese study of NPOS in 2012.

italicized first part was there just to provide a context. The three possible judgments were defined as set out in (37).

(37) *Definition of the possible choices in the Object Shift study in December 2012*
  ja 'yes': 'A NATURAL sentence. I could easily have said this.'
  ?: 'A QUESTIONABLE sentence. I would hardly say this.'
  nei 'no': 'An UNNATURAL sentence. I could not say this.'

If we compare these alternatives to those defined for the pilot study above, the most important difference is in the definition of the first alternative, where the word 'common' has been eliminated (refer to the comment in note 17).

The questionnaire contained 30 Faroese sentences to be evaluated in this fashion plus five examples where the subjects were asked to choose between two alternatives. The example sentences were of different kinds – fewer than 20 of them had anything to do with Object Shift and the rest were fillers or tested something quite different. The examples in (38) involve simple NPOS. In each part of (38), and also (40)–(43) below, the first thee lines represent the context and the bottom three lines provide the Object Shift example.

The following examples involved simple NPOS:

(38) a. OS01 **Zakaris** og   Jens gjørdust óvinir.
           Zakaris   and Jens became   enemies
           'Zakaris and Jens became enemies.'
           Jens hjálpti **Zakaris** <u>aldri</u>   aftaná tað.
           Jens helped   Zakaris   never   after   that
           'Jens never helped Zakaris after that.'
   b. OS02 Eg havi hoyrt um   **filmin**   um   Barbaru og   eg
           I   have heard about movie.DEF about Barbara and I
           havi lisið bókina,
           have read   book.DEF
           'I have heard about the movie about Barbara and I have read the book,'
           men eg sá **filmin**   <u>ikki</u>, tá ið hann varð vístur í Havn.
           but I   saw movie.DEF not   when it   was   shown in Tórshavn
           'but I didn't see the movie when it was shown in Tórshavn.'

c. OS05 Janus hevur einki samband við **foreldrini**
         Janus has   no   contackt with parents.DEF
         'Janus has no contact with his parents'
         og   hann nevnir **mammu sína** <u>ongantíð</u>.
         and he   mentions mother his   never
         'and he never mentions his mother.'

d. OS11 Tey høvdu bæði **mjólk** og   vatn   við   sær,
         they had   both   milk   and water with themselves
         'They had both milk and water with them,'
         men tey drukku **mjólkina** <u>ikki</u>.
         but   they drank   milk.DEF   not
         'but they didn't drink the milk.'

The judgments of these examples are shown in Table 7. In this table and in Tables 8–10 below, the numbers in the columns headed by *Yes*, *?* and *No* are percentages with the actual number of subjects in parentheses. Note also that sentences *a*, *b*, *c*, etc. in the tables correspond directly to the full examples *a*, *b*, *c*, etc. given in the text. Thus, example *c* in Table 7 is example *c* in (38), etc.

Number	Example	Yes	?	No	=	N
a. OS01	Jens hjálpti **Zakaris** <u>aldri</u> aftaná tað.	8.3 (2)	25.0 (6)	**66.7** (16)	100%	24
b. OS02	men eg sá **filmin** <u>ikki</u>, tá ið hann varð . . .	12.5 (3)	4.2 (1)	**83.3** (20)	100%	24
c. OS05	og hann nevnir **mammu sína** <u>ongantíð</u>.	17.4 (4)	8.7 (2)	**73.9** (17)	100%	23
d. OS11	men tey drukku **mjólkina** <u>ikki</u>.	4.3 (1)	0 (0)	**95.7** (22)	100%	23

Table 7. Judgments of simple NPOS examples in Faroese, see (38).

As can be seen here, all examples are rejected by the majority of the speakers but the results vary considerably from one sentence to another (the rejection rate was 66.7–95.7% and one example was considered 'questionable' by 25% of the subjects). But let us look a bit more closely at the two examples that are rejected by the lowest number of speakers, namely *a* and *c*.

First, it is interesting to note that example *a* in Table 7 is now rejected by two-thirds of the subjects (66.7%), but when a corresponding example was presented without any context to the subjects in the pilot study in 2006, it was rejected by 86% of the subjects (see example *b* in Table 4 above). Two possible explanations suggest themselves. On the one hand it is possible that the context provided for example *a* in Table 7 is responsible for the more positive judgment (see (37a)): The shifted object has been mentioned in the immediately preceding sentence and is thus old (defocused) information. The other possibility, suggested by one of the reviewers, is

that 'the addition of extra modifiers immediately following *aldri* ... might have an ameliorating effect', i.e. making it possible to interpret the sequence *aldri aftan á tað* as a heavy adverbial phrase that could occur VP-finally. In the case of example *c*, the sentence found natural by the highest number of speakers, no such explanation suggests itself, however.

To investigate this further, I conducted a small comparison with Danish. A questionnaire containing examples corresponding to the Faroese ones under discussion here was presented to a number of native speakers of Danish.[24] These are shown in (39):

(39) a. Lars og Jens blev uvenner.
    Lars and Jens became enemies
    'Lars and Jens became enemies.'
    Jens hjalp **Lars** aldrig efter det.
    Jens helped Lars never after that
    'Jens never helped Lars after that.'
  b. John har ingen kontakt med sine forældre
    John has no contact with his.REFL parents
    'John has no contact with his parents'
    og han nævner **sin mor** aldrig.
    and he mentions his.REFL mother never
    'and he never mentions his mother.'

Here, (39a) has the same kind of adverbial modification as its Faroese counterpart in (38a), so if a non-NPOS-interpretation ('heavy sentence-final adverbial phrase') is responsible for the relatively positive judgment of (38a) in Faroese, we would expect it to work the same way in Danish. The example in (39b) corresponds to (38c), and here no such interpretation offers itself. Hence, we would expect (38b) to be judged less positively than (39a) if the kind of adverbial interpretation just described played a role in the judgment of (39a) (and (38a)). The judgments of these Danish examples are shown in Table 8.

Number	Example	Yes	?	No	=	N
a. OS01	Jens hjalp **Lars** aldrig efter det.	0 (0)	7.7 (1)	**92.3** (12)	100%	13
b. OS05	og han nævner **sin mor** aldrig.	0 (0)	15.4 (2)	**84.6** (11)	100%	13

Table 8. **Judgments of simple NPOS examples in Danish, see (39).**

Comparison of these judgments with those of examples *a* and *c* in Table 7 above suggests that speakers of Faroese are more likely than speakers of Danish to accept simple NPOS examples, given a context appropriate for NPOS. But although some contexts can make some simple NPOS examples acceptable to some speakers of

Faroese, that is not a very satisfying result in itself. It suggests, however, that it might be worthwhile to look more closely at NPOS in Faroese and vary contexts and types of NPOS.

Let us then look at the examples of complex NPOS tested in the Faroese study, where varius contexts were used. The examples are listed in (40):

(40) a. OS10 Eg kenni bæði **systkinini**
               I   know   both   siblings.DEF
               'I know both siblings.'

               og eg helt   **gentuna** <u>ongantíð</u> vera   serliga   gløgga.
               and I   believed girl.DEF   never   be.INF particularly bright
               'and I never considered the girl to be particularly bright.'

      b. OS03 Hon tók sonin   og   **abban**   altíð   við til Havnar,
               she   took son.def and grandpa.DEF always   with to Tórshavn
               'She took the son and the grandpa always with her to Tórshavn'

               men hon læt **abban**   <u>ikki</u> koyra   bilin,   bara sonin.
               but   she   let   grandpa.DEF not   drive.INF car.DEF, only   son.DEF
               'but she never let the grandpa drive the car, only the son.'

      c. OS12 Tóra sigur, at   hon leggur dent   á javnstøðu,
               Tora   says   that   she   puts   emphasis on equality
               'Tora says that she emphasizes equality,'

               men hon letur **sonin**   <u>altíð</u>   vaska   upp, ongantíð
               but   she   lets   son.DEF   always   wash.INF up   never
               dóttrina.
               daughter.DEF
               'but she always lets the son wash up, never the daughter.'

      d. OS17 Far við á   útferðina   við skúlaflokkinum,
               go   with on excursion.DEF with class.DEF
               'Go on the excursion with the class,'

               men lat **genturnar** <u>ikki</u> fanga   teg við eygnakøstum sínum.
               but   let   girls.DEF   not   catch.INF you with glances   their.REFL
               'but don't let the girls catch you with their glances.'

      e. OS04 Jógvan: Eg haldi, at   hundurin kanska hevur bitið **barnið**
               Jogvan I   think   that   dog.DEF   perhaps has   bit   child.DEF
               'Jogvan: I think the dog may have bit the child.'

               Turið: Tað haldi eg ikki. Vit hoyrdu **barnið**   <u>ongantíð</u> gráta.
               Turid: that think I   not   we   heard   child.DEF never   cry.INF
               'Turid: I don't think so. We never heard the child cry.'

      f. OS08 Knappliga var flogstøðin   full av ferðafólkum,
               suddenly   was air terminal.DEF full of   travellers
               'Suddenly the air terminal was full of travellers,'

               men vit hoyrdu **flogfarið** <u>ongantíð</u> koma.
               but   we   heard   plane.DEF   never   come.INF
               'but we never heard the plane arrive.'

g. OS15 **Børnini** vildu ofta keypa sær góðgæti.
  children.DEF wanted often buy themselves candy
  'The children often wanted to buy candy.'
  Vit sóu **drongin** <u>stundum</u> leypa oman í krambúðina.
  we saw boy.DEF sometimes run.INF down to store.DEF
  'We sometimes saw the boy run down to the store.'

As can be seen here, the contexts vary, and Table 9 shows the results.

Number	Example	Yes	?	No	=	N
a. OS10	og eg helt **gentuna** <u>ongantíð</u> vera serliga gløgga.	21.7 (5)	21.7 (5)	**56.5** (13)	100%	23
b. OS03	men hon læt **abban** <u>ikki</u> koyra bilin, bara sonin.	4.2 (1)	29.2 (7)	**66.7** (16)	100%	24
c. OS12	men hon letur **sonin** <u>altíð</u> vaska upp, ongantíð dóttrina.	31.8 (7)	31.8 (7)	**36.4** (8)	100%	22
d. OS17	men lat **genturnar** <u>ikki</u> fanga teg við eygnakøstum sínum.	21.7 (5)	34.8 (8)	**43.5** (10)	100%	23
e. OS04	Vit hoyrdu **barnið** <u>ongantíð</u> gráta.	20.8 (5)	16.7 (4)	**62.5** (15)	100%	24
f. OS08	men vit hoyrdu **flogfarið** <u>ongantíð</u> koma.	4.2 (1)	12.5 (3)	**83.3** (20)	100%	24
g. OS15	Vit sóu **drongin** <u>stundum</u> leypa oman í krambúðina.	31.8 (7)	27.3 (6)	**40.9** (9)	100%	22

Table 9. **Judgments of complex NPOS examples in Faroese, see (40).**

With the exception of two examples (*b* and *f*), these sentences receive much more positive judgments than the simple ones in Table 5 above.[25] The reason may be that the context sentences were more appropriate here. Note also that since examples *e* and *f* are virtually 'minimal pairs', the fact that *e* is judged much more positively must mean that here the context provided was more appropriate.

The fact that the complex NPOS examples are on the whole more positively judged than the simple ones is somewhat surprising. Hence, it is necessary to try to determine whether some of them might perhaps not involve NPOS at all. One of the things that have to be taken into account is whether it is possible to interpret the crucial adverb (the one that the object is supposed to have 'shifted' across) as belonging to the infinitival (or small) clause rather than being a direct part of the matrix clause (recall also the comment in note 8 above). This is typically a very far-fetched or even impossible interpretation when the adverb is 'not' or 'never' (it is, for example, impossible to hear a child 'never cry' as opposed to 'never to hear'

a child cry, see example *e*). It is somewhat more plausible to suggest that the adverb 'sometimes' in example *g* can be interpreted in such a way (i.e. the boy was seen to 'sometimes run').

Again, comparison with Danish should be helpful here: If speakers of Danish do not have NPOS as a part of their grammar, whereas (some) speakers of Faroese do, then Danish examples corresponding to the Faroese ones in (40) should in general receive a less positive evaluation than their Faroese counterparts and only be judged positively if they can be interpreted as not involving NPOS. As explained above, the most promising candidate for such an interpretation would be an example corresponding to (40g). But if NPOS is neither an option for speakers of Danish nor Faroese, then Danish examples corresponding to the Faroese ones in (40) should be judged in a similar fashion. To test this, the Danish questionnaire mentioned above contained the following examples (where (41a) corresponds to (40a), (41e) to (40e), etc.):[26]

(41) a. Jeg kender begge søskende
          I   know   both   brother-and-sister
          'I know both the brother and the sister'
          og jeg fandt **pigen** aldrig specielt   fornuftig.
          and I   found girl.DEF never particularly bright
          'and I never considered the girl particularly bright.'

     b. Hun tog altid   sønnen   og manden   med til København,
         she took always son.DEF and husband.DEF with to Copenhagen
         'She took the son and the husband always with her to Copenhagen'
         men hun lod **manden**   ikke køre   bilen,   kun sønnen.
         but she let husband.DEF not drive.INF car.DEF only son.DEF
         'but she never let the husband drive the car, only the son.'

     e. Jacob: Jeg tror, at   hunden måske har bidt barnet.
         Jacob I   think that dog.DEF perhaps has bit child.DEF
         'Jacob: I think the dog may have bit the child.'
         Tanja: Det tror jeg ikke. Vi hørte **barnet** aldrig græde.
         Tanja: that think I   not we heard child.DEF never cry.INF
         'Tanja: I don't think so. We never heard the child cry.'

     f. Pludselig var lufthavnen   fuld af turister,
         suddenly was air terminal.DEF full of tourists
         'Suddenly the air terminal was full of travellers,'
         men vi hørte **flyet**   aldrig komme.
         but we heard plane.DEF never come.INF
         'but we never heard the plane arrive.'

     g. Børnene   ville   ofte købe sig   slik.
         children.DEF wanted often buy themselves candy
         'The children often wanted to buy candy.'
         Vi så **drengen** sommetider løbe   ned   i butikken.
         we saw boy.DEF   sometimes run.INF down to store.DEF
         'We sometimes saw the boy run down to the store.'

The judgments of these examples are presented in Table 10.

Number	Example	Yes	?	No	=	N
a. OS10	og jeg fandt **pigen** <u>aldrig</u> specielt fornuftig.	7.7 (1)	15.4 (2)	**76.9** (10)	100%	13
b. OS03	men hun lod **manden** <u>ikke</u> køre bilen, kun sønnen.	0 (0)	0 (0)	**100** (13)	100%	13
e. OS04	Vi hørte **barnet** <u>aldrig</u> græde.	0 (0)	15.4 (2)	**84.6** (11)	100%	13
f. OS08	men vi hørte **flyet aldrig** omme.	7.7 (1)	0 (0)	**92.3** (12)	100%	13
g. OS15	Vi så **drengen** <u>sommetider</u> løbe ned i butikken.	25.0 (3)	**50.0** (6)	25.0 (3)	100%	12

Table 10. Judgments of complex NPOS examples in Danish, see (41).

As Table 10 shows, the only example that is not rejected by almost all the subjects is example *g*, namely the one where a non-NPOS interpretation is more plausible than in the other instances. Hardly any speakers accept the other examples. This suggests that NPOS is typically not an option for Danish speakers, whereas it is for some speakers of Faroese.

Finally, consider the following. One of the examples that the Faroese subjects were presented with was this:

(42) Fólk,   komin   reiðiliga   væl til árs,   minnast   flestu teirra
     people come.PAST.PART reasonably well to year remember   most   them.DEF
     'People who are getting on in years remember most of them'

     og   tað ger **bókina**   <u>ikki</u>/ger   <u>ikki</u>   **bókina**   minni áhugaverda.
     and that makes book.DEF   not/makes not   book.DEF less   interesting
     'and that doesn't make the book less interesting.'
     (= 'and that makes the book even more interesting.')

The subjects were told that they could select one or both of the alternatives.[27] The results of their choices are shown in Table 11 below. Here almost half the subjects say that both alternatives are OK. This example is actually taken from a book announcement on the Internet, where the NPOS variant (*ger bókina ikki*) was the one used.[28] This is not surprising: The book was obviously defocused (old information) in the context because the book is what the whole announcement was about (this was not as obvious in the limited context given in the questionnaire). A similar example, given here in (43), was included in the Danish questionnaire.

Alternative selected	%	NN
og tað ger **bókina** <u>ikki</u> …	8.7	2
og tað ger <u>ikki</u> **bókina** …	47.8	11
og tað ger **bókina** <u>ikki</u>/ger <u>ikki</u> **bókina** (both alternatives OK)	43.5	10
Total:	100	23

Table 11. **Choice between two alternatives in Faroese: shifted vs. unshifted object, see (42).**

(43) Folk,   som er   kommet lidt   op i årene,
      people   that are   come   little up in years.DEF

      kan huske   de fleste af begivenhederne
      can remember the most of happenings.DEF

      'People who are getting on in years remember most of the events'

      og   det gør   **bogen**   <u>ikke</u> / gør   <u>ikke</u> **bogen**   mindre interessant.
      and that makes book.DEF not / makes not   book.DEF less   interesting

      'and that doesn't make the book less interesting.'

The results of the Danish survey are shown in Table 12. The contrast with the Faroese results presented in Table 11 is very clear.

Alternative selected	%	NN
og det gør bogen <u>ikke</u>	7.7	1
og det gør <u>ikke</u> bogen	**92.3**	12
og det gør bogen <u>ikke</u>/gør <u>ikke</u> bogen (both alternatives OK)	0	0
Total:	100	13

Table 12. **Choice between two alternatives in Danish: shifted vs. unshifted object, see (43).**

We can thus conclude that NPOS is not in fact excluded in Faroese as has typically been assumed, whereas it seems to be in Danish. Nevertheless, NPOS appears to be more dependent on a proper context in Faroese than it is in Icelandic, witness the fact that speakers of Icelandic presented with NPOS examples 'out of the blue' typically agree that they are fine. This difference is a puzzle in itself and we return to it in the final section.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper we have seen evidence for the following:

(44) a.   NPOS WAS AN OPTION in Old Norse. It is just very infrequent in Old Norse texts, but the same is true of younger Icelandic text, even modern ones.

Part of the reason is that even when the information structure conditions (discourse conditions) for NPOS are fulfilled, the movement is optional.[29]

b. NPOS IS AN OPTION in Faroese but it is heavily dependent on context, much more so than in Icelandic. This has typically been overlooked in the literature and hence linguists have concluded that NPOS is not available in Faroese.

The claim is that this solves the Old Norse Puzzle and the Faroese Puzzle stated in (2) above. This also means that H&P (1995) may have been on the right track to begin with when they suggested a correlation between m-case and NPOS, and there was thus no reason for them to try to develop an account of why Faroese did not appear to have NPOS. Hence, it is not surprising that their attempt to do so failed.[30]

Based on the empirical results of the paper, I would like to make the following two general claims:

(45) a. Completely natural constructions, like NPOS in Modern Icelandic, may be hard to find in corpus searches.

b. While NPOS is an integral part of the grammar of all speakers of Icelandic, it is an exceptional option for most speakers of Faroese, i.e. not a part of their default (or dominant) grammar.

The first claim is straightforward and needs no further explanation but I would like to conclude this paper by elaborating on the second one.

Many recent studies have demonstrated extensive variation in Faroese with respect to the syntactic features that distinguish Icelandic from Mainland Scandinavian. It has been shown, for instance, that some speakers accept (and use) V-to-I movement in embedded clauses to some extent but not all the time, or dative subjects where they are 'expected' in some examples but not others (see e.g. Jónsson & Eythórsson 2005, 2011; Bentzen et al. 2009; Thráinsson 2009, 2010a, 2013; Angantýsson 2011; Heycock et al. 2012; and references cited by these authors). These studies have thus shown that the variation involved is not just from speaker to speaker (inter-speaker variation), e.g. in the sense that some speakers have an Icelandic-type grammar whereas others have an MSc-type 'grammar', but there is also extensive intra-speaker variation with respect to these features. An adequate description of Faroese syntax will have to take this into account.

A promising approach is to think of this in terms of competing grammars (see e.g. Kroch 1989 and later work; Yang 2002, 2004, 2010; Thráinsson 2013). To take V-to-I as an example, it seems clear that the typical MSc order (i.e. Adv–V_{fin}) is the default order for most (possibly all) speakers of Faroese for all clause types, whereas the opposite is true of Icelandic (see the references cited in the preceding paragraph, especially Angantýsson 2011). We can then say that the MSc-type 'grammar' (or parameter setting or whatever) is the default (or dominant) grammar for speakers of Faroese in this respect, although some of the speakers are more likely than others

to accept and use the (Icelandic) V_{fin}–Adv order, given the appropriate conditions.[31] For speakers of Icelandic, it is the other way around: The V_{fin}–Adv order is fine in all types of embedded clauses and something special is needed to make the Adv–V_{fin} order acceptable (see Thráinsson 2010b; Angantýsson 2011 and references cited there).

Thinking about NPOS in Icelandic and Faroese along the same lines, we could account for the observed facts as follows: When speakers of Icelandic are presented with NPOS examples, they accept them right away, even when no context is provided. There does not seem to be any inter-speaker nor intra-speaker variation involved and thus no reason to assume 'competition of grammars' in this respect. But when speakers of Faroese are presented with NPOS examples 'out of the blue', they typically reject them (recall the discussion in Section 5.1 above) since NPOS is not a part of their default or dominant grammar. But when NPOS examples are presented in a context which makes it clear that the shifted object must have the reading typical for such elements (whatever the appropriate definition of this reading may be, recall the discussion in Section 4), then a number of speakers find such examples acceptable. Hence, we would also expect to find examples in Faroese texts, although they should be even less frequent than corresponding examples in Icelandic corpora.

But what kind of a model of grammar competition could account for this behavior of the Faroese speakers? To simplify the presentation, we can think of the NPOS option as a parameter (although that is probably not the correct way). Building on ideas developed by Yang (2002, 2004, 2010), we could then say that in the grammar of speakers who show no intra-speaker variation with respect to this feature, this parameter has either the value 0 (no NPOS) or 1 (NPOS freely accepted and used). For speakers who show intra-speaker variation the value would then lie somewhere between 0 and 1. According to standard assumptions, and evidence discussed, speakers of Danish will have set this parameter at 0, and speakers of Icelandic at 1. Thus, the results of this paper suggest that the value lies somewhere between 0 and 1 for many speakers of Faroese and the more dominant their Danish-type grammar is (or the Danish-type setting for this 'parameter'), the closer to 0 this setting will be.

The general claim is that this is a sensible way of modeling variation when we have a 'change in progress'. In such a situation, we will typically have extensive intra-speaker variation, in addition to inter-speaker variation. Although this would seem to be a non-ideal state of affairs, evidence suggests that it is much more common than often assumed.[32]

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

help with translating Faroese examples into Danish, to Frans Gregersen and Louise Willemoës Gad for collecting judgments on the Danish examples, to three anonymous reviewers for very helpful and constructive comments, and to the audience and the organizers of the workshop on Scandinavian Object Shift in Gothenburg in March 2012.

NOTES

1. Danish and Norwegian examples corresponding to (1b) are also ungrammatical. In this paper I will not consider examples of the kind used by Nilsen (1997) to argue that NPOS is acceptable in Norwegian. These typically involve a stack of adverbs where there are various possibilities with respect to the order of the object and the adverbs. Hence, it is very difficult to determine what they tell us about the location of particular constituent boundaries (see also Thráinsson 2007:70n).

2. In this paper, the terms Old Norse and Old Icelandic will be used somewhat interchangibly, although Old Norse is the more international term, so to speak. What is meant is the language spoken in Iceland, Norway and the Faroe Islands in the middle ages (until the 14th or 15th century or so). Most of the texts preserved from this period are believed to have been written in Iceland or are only preserved in Icelandic manuscripts.

3. Linguists have used terms like 'strong', 'specific' and 'defocused', and more to describe the relevant reading of shifted (vs. non-shifted) objects. The exact definition of the relevant contrasts need not concern us here (but see Section 4 below).

4. In fact, I find that (8c) with the pronoun in situ deserves a full asterisk if the pronoun is unstressed.

5. In Swedish, on the other hand, it is possible to leave an unstressed pronoun in situ in examples of this kind, as is well known. The other Scandinavian languages are typically like Danish in this respect, except for some Norwegian dialects (see e.g. Thráinsson 2007:66ff.).

6. According to Sundquist (2002), Mason claimed that she had found two potential examples of NPOS in her corpus (the total number of objects in the corpus was reportedly 198), but one of these was misanalyzed, as Sundquist (2002:332–333) points out.

7. Holmberg & Platzack (1995:172) suggest that the shifted indirect object in constructions of this kind is 'a covert PP in Norwegian and certain varieties of Swedish. Thus, it has inherent Case, in a sense, and we are therefore not surprised to find that it can undergo shift'.

8. Note that some examples of this type will be ambiguous since an adverb following an object can belong to the infinitival clause rather than the matrix, as in examples like the following (from the same corpus):

(i) menn létu **þann flokk** aldrei þrífast
   men   let   that group.ACC never thrive.INF

Here the adverb *aldrei* 'never' could be interpreted as a part of the infinitival clause, witness the fact that expressions like the following are common in the sagas:

(ii) Þeir báðu   hann   [aldrei þrífast]
      they asked him.ACC never thrive.INF
      'They wished that he would never thrive' [i.e. be happy, successful . . .]

A comparable interpretation seems very far fetched for the adverb *þó* 'nevertheless' in (15).

9. Note that the purpose of this search was NOT to do a complete search for all possible examples of NPOS in the treebank. The only point I wish to make here is that if one does the same kind of search for all the centuries represented in the treebank (from the 12th to the 21st), there is in fact no difference in frequency of the kind of NPOS searched for between the older texts and the more modern ones. Furthermore, the examples looked for (full NP object preceding the negation or the adverb 'never') are of the kind typically considered when it is claimed that Old Norse was different from Modern Icelandic in not allowing NPOS.

10. As is well known, Icelandic has a number of predicates that take a dative subject and a nominative object (see e.g. the overview in Thráinsson (2007:167ff.) and references cited there). The predicate *ganga úr hug* seems to be one of these (see e.g. inversion examples like *Gekk honum Ketilríður aldrei úr hug?* lit. 'went him.DAT Ketilridur.NOM never from mind', i.e. 'Didn't he ever forget Ketilridur?') and in (16b) the nominative object has shifted across the adverb *aldrei*, as nominative objects can do, just like other objects (see e.g. Thráinsson 2007:65–66).

11. As pointed out by one of the reviewers, it is in fact possible to interpret some of the examples listed in (16) as containing a negation that forms a constitutent with a following adverbial. That would then be a 'heavier' constituent which could conceivably occur VP-finally. If that were true, some of these examples would not be genuine examples of NPOS, but that would just strengthen the point being made here: Full NPOS of the kind searched for is extremely rare throughout the centuries, also in Modern Icelandic where there is no doubt that it is completely grammatical.

12. By the same token, one cannot use the available textual evidence to conclude that NPOS was not available to speakers 'in earlier stages of Mainland Scandinavian', as Sundquist (2002:333) does.

13. A suggestion by one of the reviewers improved the formulation of the two versions.

14. The qualification 'if syntactically possible' is necessary for various reasons, in particular those having to do with Holmberg's Generalization, going back to Holmberg (1986) and sometimes formulated like this: The object cannot move out of the VP if the verb has not moved (for more recent formulations see e.g. Holmberg 1997, 1999).

15. Since there were so few examples of NPOS in Modern Icelandic found in the treebank (IcePaHC, recall Section 3.2 above), it was necessary to search for examples in this larger corpus to be able to get some idea about the information structure properties of shifted full NP objects. Although this corpus is tagged and not parsed, the user interface makes it relatively easy to conduct very useful searches (see http://mim.hi.is).

16. This also means that Icelandic is the type of language that Engels & Vikner (2007:9) claim is unattested: A language in which weak pronouns move obligatorily while movement of defocused complex phrases is optional.

17. It was a mistake to include the word 'common' (Fa. *vanligur*) in the definition of this choice, since that is a metalinguistic question asking about the language use of other speakers, different in nature from asking about ones own intuition. The word 'natural'

(Fa. *natúrligur*) would have been a better choice. See e.g. the methodological discussion in Thráinsson (2013:164–166) and references cited there. See also Section 5.3 below.

18. A total number of 243 subjects participated in this study and they fell into four age groups: 16 year olds (34%), 20–25 (23%), 40–45 (22%) and 65–70 (22%). 48% of them were male, 52% female.

19. It would obviously be interesting to study the relative size of the classes of non-case-preserving and case-preserving verbs in Faroese and the frequency of the verbs in each class. But the case-preserving *takka* 'thank' and *trúgva* 'believe' are selected here because they are obviously quite common, as can be checked on the Internet, for instance (in May 2013, Google gives over 40,000 examples of the infinitive *trúgva* and several thousands of various inflected forms of *takka*).

20. In fact, the weak pronoun may also 'prosodically incorporate' into the subject in this sense, i.e. in the case of subject-verb inversion:

    (i) Las   Jón   hana ekki?
        read John it   not
        'Didn't John read it?'

21. E-S does not explicitly say whether she made more than one recording of these sentences – she only says (page 78) that they were 'uttered by a speaker of Icelandic'. Being a native speaker of Icelandic, I find the intonation illustrated in (35b) quite odd and the one shown in (36) much more natural. Native speakers of Icelandic I have checked this with agree with me.

22. Again, the 'prosodic incorporation' works essentially the same way in the case of subject-verb inversion, except that there the negation (or other adverb) will prosodically incorporate into the subject, not the verb:

    (i) Las   ˈJón + ˌekki bókina?
        read John not   book.DEF
        'Didn't John read the book?'

The relevance of examples of this kind was pointed out to me by one of the reviewers.

23. A total of 25 subjects participated in this study, nine male and 16 female. Nine of them were 30 years old or younger, seven were 31–50 years old and nine were over 50 years old.

24. Fifteen subjects participated in the study, but results from two were eliminated since their judgments did not seem reliable. (As a test of reliability of judgments, the questionnaire contained one clearly ungrammatical example and one clearly grammatical. These subjects failed this test.) The remaining were 11 female and two male speakers, ranging in age from 21 to 31 years old, the mean age being 26. Although the gender imbalance is unfortunate, there is no reason to expect that it had any serious effect on the outcome.

25. The reasons for the low acceptance rate of example *b* may include the following: First, there is actually an 'out of the blue' NPOS in the context sentence, i.e. *tók **sonin og abban** altíð* instead of *tók altíð **sonin og abban***. This was pointed out by one of the subjects and it may have influenced the judgments of some of the other subjects although they had been explicitly instructed not to judge the context sentences. Second, this example is potentially ambiguous in that it is possible to interpret the (ellipted) part 'only the son' as meaning '(let the grandpa only) drive the son'. Although this seems very far fetched, one of the subjects did in fact ask whether it was possible to 'drive the son'.

26. The Danish variants constructed as counterparts to (40c, d) are omitted here since they were arguably judged unacceptable by most of the subjects for reasons having nothing to do with NPOS.

27. The alternatives were presented as follows:

        __ ger bókina ikki
    og tað   minni áhugaverda.
        __ ger ikki bókina

    (Lit.: 'and that makes the book not/makes not the book less interesting'.) This way of presenting the alternatives should have made it less tempting for the subjects to construe *ikki minni áhugaverda* as a constituent in the first alternative, which would otherwise have been a possible interpretation (and one which would not involve NPOS, as pointed out by a reviewer).

28. The URL was http://www.sendistovan.fo/Default.aspx?ID=355&Action=1&NewsId=1303&PID=976 (December 2012).

29. Although the concept of MOVEMENT is used here, and throughout the paper, it is obviously possible to put this differently if one is partial to non-movement frameworks.

30. As pointed out by a reviewer, Övdalian would, however, be a remaining puzzle if it has rich case morphology but not NPOS. But it is a puzzle anyway since it has been reported to be the only Scandinavian language not to have pronominal Object Shift either (see Garbacz 2009:85).

31. What exactly the 'appropriate conditions' are need not concern us here. As shown by Angantýsson (2011), for instance, Faroese speakers differ from Icelandic speakers in that they are typically very reluctant to accept the V_{fin}–Adv order in certain types of embedded clauses, e.g. indirect questions and relatives.

32. For a similar argumentation and conclusion with respect to Dative Substitution in Icelandic and Faroese see Thráinsson (2013).

REFERENCES

Andréasson, Maia. 2010. Object Shift or object placement in general? In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG10 Conference*, 26–42. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Angantýsson, Ásgrímur. 2011. *The Syntax of Embedded Clauses in Icelandic and Related Languages*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iceland.

Árnason, Kristján. 1996. How to meet the European standard: Word stress in Faroese and Icelandic. *Nordlyd* 24, 1–22.

Árnason, Kristján. 2011. *The Phonology of Icelandic and Faroese*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barnes, Michael. 1992. Faroese syntax: Achievenemts, goals, and problems. In Jonna Louis-Jensen & Jóhan Hendrik W. Poulsen (eds.), *The Nordic Languages and Modern Linguistics 7*, 17–37. Tórshavn Føroya Fróðskaparfelag.

Bentzen, Kristine, Piotr Garbacz, Caroline Heycock & Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson. 2009. On variation in Faroese verb placement. *Nordlyd* 36(2), 78–102. [NORMS Papers on Faroese]

Collins, Chris & Höskuldur Thráinsson. 1996. VP-internal structure and Object Shift in Icelandic. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27(3), 391–444.

de Hoop, Helen. 1990. Restrictions on existential sentences and Object Scrambling: Some facts from Dutch. *9th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* (WCCFL 9), 277–288.

de Hoop, Helen. 1992. *Case Configuration and Noun Phrase Interpretation*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Groningen, Groningen. [Published 1996 by Garland, New York.]

Diesing, Molly. 1996. Semantic variables and Object Shift. In Höskuldur Thráinsson, Samuel David Epstein & Steve Peter (eds.), *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax*, vol. II (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory), 66–84. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Diesing, Molly. 1997. Yiddish VP order and the typology of object movement in Germanic. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 15, 369–427.

Diesing, Molly & Eloise Jelinek. 1993. The syntax and semantics of Object Shift. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 51, 1–54.

Diesing, Molly & Eloise Jelinek. 1995. Distributing arguments. *Natural Language Semantics* 3, 123–176.

Engels, Eva & Sten Vikner. 2007. Object Shift, Scrambling, and Optimality Theory. Ms., University of Aarhus.

Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 2005. Sound patterns of syntax: Object Shift. *Theoretical Linguistics* 31, 47–93.

Garbacz, Piotr. 2009. *Issues in Övdalian Syntax*. Ph.D. dissertation, Lund University.

Haugan, Jens. 2000. *Old Norse Word Order and Information Structure*. Ph.D. dissertation, NTNU, Trondheim.

Heycock, Caroline, Antonella Sorace, Zakaris Svabo Hansen, Frances Wilson & Sten Vikner. 2012. Detecting the late stages of syntactic change: The loss of V-to-T in Faroese. *Language* 88(3), 558–600.

Holmberg, Anders. 1986. *Word Order and Syntactic Features in the Scandinavian Languages and English*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Stockholm.

Holmberg, Anders. 1997. The true nature of Holmberg's Generalization. *NELS* 27, 203–217.

Holmberg, Anders. 1999. Remarks on Holmberg's Generalisation. *Studia Linguistica* 53, 1–39.

Holmberg, Anders & Christer Platzack. 1991. On the role of inflection in Scandinavian syntax. In Werner Abraham, Wim Kosmeijer & Eric Reuland (eds.), *Issues in Germanic Syntax*, 93–118. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Holmberg, Anders & Christer Platzack. 1995. *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Íslensk orðtíðnibók [Icelandic frequency dictionary]. 1991. Editor Jörgen Pind. Co-ediors Friðrik Magnússon & Stefán Briem. Reykjavík: Orðabók Háskólans.

Jónsson, Jóhannes Gísli & Thórhallur Eythórsson. 2005. Variation and change in subject case marking in Insular Scandinavian. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 28(2), 223–245.

Jónsson, Jóhannes Gísli & Thórhallur Eythórsson. 2011. Structured exceptions and case selection in Insular Scandinavian. In Heike Wiese & Horst Simon (eds.), *Expecting the Unexpected: Exceptions in Grammar*, 213–242. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kroch, Anthony S. 1989. Reflexes of grammar in patterns of language change. *Language Variation and Change* 1, 199–244.

Lockwood, William B. 1977. *An Introduction to Modern Faroese*. Tórshavn: Føroya Skúlabókagrunnur. [First published 1955, reprinted by Føroya Skúlabókagrunnur 2002.]

Mason, L. 1999. Object Shift in Old Norse. MA thesis, University of York.

Nilsen, Øystein. 1997. Adverbs and A-shift. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 59, 1–31.

Rögnvaldsson, Eiríkur & Sigrún Helgadóttir. 2011. Morphosyntactic tagging of Old Icelandic texts and its use in studying syntactic variation and change. Caroline Sporleder, Antal van den Bosch & Kalliopi A. Zervanou (eds.), *Language Technology for Cultural Heritage: Selected Papers from the LaTeCH Workshop Series, Theory and Applications of Natural Language Processing*, 63–76. Berlin: Springer.

Rögnvaldsson, Eiríkur, Anton Karl Ingason, Einar Freyr Sigurðsson & Joel Wallenberg. 2011. Creating a dual-purpose treebank. *Journal for Language Technology and Computational Linguistics* 26(2), 141–152.

Sundquist, John D. 2002. Object Shift and Holmberg's Generalization in the history of Norwegian. In David W. Lightfoot (ed.), *Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change*, 326–347. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2001. Object Shift and Scrambling. In Mark Baltin & Chris Collins (eds.), *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*, 148–202. Oxford: Blackwell.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2007. *The Syntax of Icelandic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2009. Looking for parametric correlations within Faroese. *Nordlyd* 36(2), 1–24. [NORMS Papers on Faroese]

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2010a. Variation and parametric correlations in Faroese. Ms., University of Iceland.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2010b. Predictable and unpredictable sources of variable verb and adverb placement in Scandinavian. *Lingua* 120(5), 1062–1088.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2013. Ideal speakers and other speakers: The case of dative and some other cases. In Beatriz Fernández & Ricardo Etxepare (eds.), *Variation in Datives: A Microcomparative Perspective*, 161–188. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur, Hjalmar P. Petersen, Jógvan í Lon Jacobsen & Zakaris Svabo Hansen. 2012. *Faroese: A Handbook and Reference Grammar*, 2nd edn. Tórshavn: Faroe University Press & Reykjavík: Linguistic Institute, University of Iceland. [Originally published 2004.]

Vikner, Sten. 1994. Scandinavian Object Shift and West Germanic Scrambling. In Norbert Corver & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Studies on Scrambling*, 487–517. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Vikner, Sten. 1997. The interpretation of Object Shift, Optimality Theory and Minimalism. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 60, 1–24.

Vikner, Sten. 2001. The interpretation of Object Shift and Optimality Theory. In Gereon Müller & Wolfgang Sternefeld (eds.), *Competition in Syntax*, 321–340. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Vikner, Sten. 2005. Object Shift. In Henk van Riemsdijk & Martin Everaert (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, 392–436. Oxford: Blackwell.

Yang, Charles. 2002. *Knowledge and Learning in Natural Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yang, Charles. 2004. Universal Grammar, statistics or both? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 8(10), 451–456.

Yang, Charles. 2010. Three factors in language variation. *Lingua* 120(5), 1160–1177.