INTRODUCTION

1. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The three papers in this collection are cast within a theory which acknowledges the basic theoretical foundations of chomskyan generative linguists, notably the idea that the language capacity of human beings constitutes a separate and distinct component in the human brain, genetically determined and common to the all members of the species (see e.g. Chomsky 1986, 1988, 1995a, 1995b). As much other work within the tradition, the goal of the papers is nevertheless not to characterize and define the language capacity thus understood, i.e. as a biological phenomenon. Rather their concern is to give an adequate account of linguistic phenomena within a coherent theory which *in principle* could be taken to reflect cognitive traits and capacities. A general and necessary requirement for the theory is therefore that its principles be language independent.

In the latter respect the present theory does not offer a radically new conception of linguistic theory—for the most part it will refer to well-established notions and principles of grammar assumed and advocated by linguists working within the chomskyan research tradition, and in particular it should be seen as a variety of 'Minimalism' as presented in Chomsky (1995, 1998). In certain respects, however, the theory defines its own path, and in particular it claims that the composition of phrase structural objects to a great extent is driven by semantics, and hence that their phrase structure indicates how they are to be interpreted.

In motivating this view a somewhat unorthodox conception of the triggers for 'movement' arises, crucially involving the notion of 'identification'. The essential idea behind this notion is that for bits of phrase structure to exist, they must host some linguistic material. And since the bits of phrase structure have semantic import, their existence/pre-

sence is necessary for certain semantic properties to obtain. This principle and its theoretical consequences constitute the main theoretical contribution of this thesis, and the term 'identification' is therefore a natural part of its title. Moreover, in the following I will refer to the theory that I advocate as 'Identification Theory'.

The theory adheres to the standard assumption that the composition of phrase structural objects follows a generalized schema defined by UG, described by the so-called X'-theory. X'-theory was developed during the seventies—the cornerstone was laid by Chomsky (1970), and a seminal work is that of Jackendoff (1977). (See otherwise Chomsky 1995:51ff for a brief review of the development of and motivation for X'-theory.) The generalized schema introduced by X'-theory replaced the former construction specific phrase structure rules. In its standard form this schema consists of the following two general rules where X, Z, and Y are variables for classes of lexical categories.

(1) a. XP —> ZP X'
b. X' —> X^0 YP

These two rules yield a three-levelled structure assumed to terminate in a lexical category of type X under X^0. On that account XP is a 'projection' of a lexical category of type X, and the X'-schema thus represents a way of modelling the ways in which a lexical category may combine with other lexical categories to form a 'phrase': projections of lexical categories may "attach" to the projection of other lexical categories in specific ways. The result is a hierarchical structure which allows one to express a variety of relations and dependencies holding between lexical categories, i.e. the constituents of a phrase. Examples of such dependencies are the head-complement relation (holding between X^0 and YP above), the head-specifier relation (holding between X^0 and ZP above), dominance and c-command, etc. In turn the definition of these phrase structural dependencies are exploited in defining global principles of grammar. These issues are well-known and readers not familiar with them may consult works like Van Riemsdijk and Williams (1986), Nordgård and Åfarli (1990), Haegeman (1991), or Platzack (1998) for discussion and exemplification.

The development of X'-theory was empirically motivated by the observation that certain regularities exist across syntactic constructions involving different classes of constituents. Parallels may for instance be drawn between verb–complement and preposition–complement structures and between finite clauses and nominalizations, in the latter case involving a verb and a noun as the θ-assigning head, respectively. The generalized phrase structure schema serves to capture these parallels, and in that respect X'-theory represented a step in the direction of a general principle which could more plausibly be a part of UG than a list of language and construction specific phrase structure rules.

An important point about the evolvement of X'-theory was that it was first assumed to only apply to the so-called 'lexical categories' A, N, V, and P, i.e. roughly the open parts of speech, and not to the 'functional' categories such as 'INFL' and 'COMP', but since

Chomsky (1986) also the functional categories were assumed to head projections formed according to the generalized X'-schema. Specific phrase structure rules were thereby eliminated from the theory altogether.

That then represented another move towards a more plausible universal ontology for grammar, i.e. one defined by UG, but for the working linguist it put heavy constraints on what phrase structures he could assume to account for empirical phenomena. As a reaction to that more functional categories than the ones traditionally assumed were postulated, first and foremost pertaining to the category INFL, originally associated with verbal inflection. In some languages verbal inflection involves both tense morphology and subject/verb agreement on the verb, and Pollock (1989) suggested that the INFL-category be split in several categories, among others one for tense morphology and one for subject/verb-agreement, and these categories became known as T and AGR, respectively.

These categories were motivated on the basis of morphology found on the finite verb, and since some languages exhibit verbal inflection systems which comprise other, and in some cases additional, morphological categories than tense and subject/verb agreement, a range of different functional categories were proposed, cf. Webelhuth (1995:69) for an overview. This created a debate as to whether the inventory of functional categories differs from one language to another depending on the morphological properties of various languages, or whether UG defines a limited set of functional categories which is found universally. The debate is important, but it will not be reviewed here since the present theory gives a clear answer to the question (cf. below). See otherwise e.g. Webelhuth (1995) and Thráinsson (1995) for discussion.

As the theory developed, syntactic movement became crucially related to a mapping between functional categories and the morphology of the lexical constituents in a derivation. In Chomsky (1995) this is expressed through the notion of 'checking' whereby functional categories are assumed to carry features that attract a constituent carrying the corresponding morphological feature. The features of the functional categories are argued to be uninterpretable, but when matching with a corresponding morphological feature obtains in a local relation, either specifier-head or head-(adjoined-to-)head, the features are "checked off" and hence eliminated. This 'checking' of uninterpretable features must take place before the derivation of the linguistic expression reaches the level of Logical-Form, i.e. the interface level between the grammatical and the conceptual-intentional components.

Importantly, a distinction is drawn between 'strong' and 'weak' features, and the difference between these types of features is that checking of strong features must take place in overt syntax, i.e. before the derivation feeds the PF-compononent (i.e. the interface level with the articulatory-perceptual system), whereas weak features may be checked after this point in the derivation (but still, of course, before LF).

The difference between for instance a language which has visible verb movement to a syntactic domain identified as AGR and a language which does not, is that the feature in need of checking is strong in the former language and weak in the latter.

A problem with the distinction between strong and weak features is that it only bears a faint relation to overt, visible morphology. The distinction was originally inspired by the observation of cases where closely related languages differ with respect to a particular movement and where the presence/absence of movement can be related to the presence/absence of overt morphology. However, in Chomsky (1995) the distinction represents an abstraction over such phenomena, simply for the reason that one also finds cases where there is overt movement but not visible morphology.

Given such a conception of the strong/weak distinction the task of the linguist is merely to classify the features of functional categories in various languages as either strong or weak depending on whether or not the correlating movement is found. Such a task appears highly trivial, and the distinction between strong and weak feature amounts to being no more than a descriptive device with no particular explanatory force within linguistic theory.

The present thesis represents a contribution to the resurrection of the role played by overt morphology in syntax. This is achieved through replacing the notion of 'checking' by the notion of 'identification'. In turn 'identification' relies on the assumption that functional categories are abstract entities with specific and well-defined semantic properties. The inventory of functional categories is therefore fixed on a semantic basis, and this is presumably encoded in UG.

'Identification' represents a licensing requirement on the abstract functional categories whereby overtly expressed constituents enter their syntactic domain, i.e. their projection, and the core idea behind this licensing requirement is that since functional categories are abstract, something must "show that they are there". The principle of 'identification' is defined as follows.

> Identification$_{def}$:
> A functional category must be identified by having a constituent containing one or more relevant morphological features either in its specifier or head position. The constituent must be merged within the extended projection of which the functional category is a part.

Just like 'checking', 'identification' represents a trigger for movement, but a crucial difference between the two notions is that whereas checking involves one abstract feature per functional category, identification involves (possibly) several features per functional category, and moreover these features are ontologically plausible in that they are either agreement features, overtly realized, or lexical features with some semantic content. Together with a preference principle which basically says that the element in a derivation/numeration that carries most relevant features will be the identifier of a given functional category, the effect of 'identification' is that movement can be triggered although the moving element carries no agreement feature. This makes it possible to evaluate the role of agreement categories in a given language separately from other morphological categories.

In the following I will give a résumé of each of the three papers as well as clarify how they are related to each other. In doing so I will refer to the papers as 'paper 1', 'paper 2', and 'paper 3', respectively, based on their order in this collection.

2. A CONFIGURATIONAL APPROACH TO INTERPRETATION

The first paper, 'A configurational approach to noun phrase interpretation', is the most general one of the papers in the collection in that Identification Theory as such is the topic addressed. In that respect it lays much of the theoretical foundation for the other two papers.

I start out by observing that there is a suggestive correlation between different kinds of determiners and linear positions in the noun phrase, and, at a more theoretical level, between types of determiners and functional projections. In short, universally quantifying determiners, definite determiners, and cardinal determiners can be argued to be associated with separate syntactic domains, alternatively functional projections, to the left of the noun, roughly as in (2).

(2) [all (of) [the [three [linguists]]]]

The starting point for the investigation is the assumption that these correlations are not accidental, but that they reflect fundamental principles of syntactic organization. By investigating the correlations, and by integrating them in a model of syntactic structure, the goal is to reach novel insights in the principles that hold for noun phrase syntax in particular and syntax more generally.

The paper thus proceeds (section 2) by discussing referentiality, and establishes three core referential properties, 'uniqueness', 'specificity', and 'countability'. The properties are defined in terms of speaker's intentions. When a noun phrase is uniquely referring the speaker assumes that the referent for the noun phrase is identifiable for the listener, and when a noun phrase is specifically referring the speaker has a certain individual in mind. In the latter case it is irrelevant whether or not the listener can identify the referent. A noun phrase is countable when it denotes a referent which consists of one or more individualized referents, i.e. a set. Conversely, an uncountable noun phrase denotes a referent which is not individualized, e.g. a mass, and again the intentions of the speaker play a certain role—I argue for instance that bare plurals in English (and similar languages) denote uncountable referents from the perspective of the speaker although their referents (in most cases) *in principle* would consist of individualized entities which *in principle* could be counted.

The findings that emerge from the discussion of referentiality are subsequently exploited when the main properties of the theory are presented (section 3). By taking the three determiner types to be representatives of the three referential properties, I argue that the three functional projections that host them are associated with the three referential

properties, and more specifically I suggest that for a noun phrase to have the referential properties in question the respective functional projections must be present in the phrase structure.

An important aspect of the theory (cf. above) is that I argue that the functional projections are headed by abstract functional categories, and not by the determiners in question. That means that the presence of determiners is not required for a noun phrase to have certain referential properties—it is the presence of the abstract functional categories that determines the referential properties. I assume that there exist four such functional categories: ν which is associated with countability and which heads NumP, the functional projection typically hosting cardinal determiners; δ which is associated with specificity and which heads DP, the functional projection typically hosting definite determiners; and $\kappa_{[+unique]}$ and $\kappa_{[-unique]}$ which head KP, the domain associated with uniqueness and typically hosting universally quantifying determiners.

The latter two functional categories constitute a pair and could be considered two varieties of one functional category, 'κ'. The two varieties of κ are of course in complementary distribution: the presence of $\kappa_{[+unique]}$ entails that the noun phrase is uniquely referring, whereas the presence of $\kappa_{[-unique]}$ that it is not. Moreover, the presence of one of them, and hence the domain KP, is obligatory in all argument noun phrases, and in these respects $\kappa_{[+unique]}$ and $\kappa_{[-unique]}$ have a different status from that of ν and δ, neither of which are obligatory in a noun phrase.

The reason why either $\kappa_{[+unique]}$ or $\kappa_{[-unique]}$ must be present in all argument noun phrases is that they serve other purposes than purely semantic ones. In particular, the presence of the KP-domain is necessary for a noun phrase to receive Case. The effect of assuming this is not demonstrated in detail in any of the three papers, but it is in line with the findings of other researchers that argument noun phrases must contain at least one determiner position, i.e. one functional projection. Moreover, by assuming the obligatory presence of KP we are able to treat noun phrases as a uniform clause level constituent type—without this assumption some noun phrases would be NPs, some NumPs, some DPs, and some KPs.

The structure assumed for the noun phrase in (2) is roughly as in (3).

(3) $[_{KP}$ **all** – $\kappa_{[+unique]}$ $[_{DP}$ **the** - δ $[_{NumP}$ **three** - ν $[_{NP}$ **linguists**]]]]

A crucial point in the theory is that the abstract functional categories must be 'identified' by an element containing relevant features according to the definition of 'identification' given above. The identifying element may either be an X^0-category which adjoins to the head, i.e. the functional category itself, or it may be an XP-category which occupies the specifier position of the projection from the head.

The morphological features relevant for identification differ for each functional category, and the identification principle represents the crucial trigger for syntactic movement within the theory. There are two reasons for that.

First, the identifying element may be merged, i.e. base-generated, in a domain to the right, and hierarchically below, the domains of the functional categories, and in such a case the identification must be met by this element moving from its original position to the projection of the functional category to be identified.

Second, since one and the same element may carry features relevant for the identification of more than one functional category, movement may obtain even if the element is merged within the domains of the functional categories.

In order to decide among several possible identifiers, a preference principle is assumed according to which for any given numeration, i.e. selection of constituents from the lexicon, the element containing most relevant features for identifying a functional category will be the one chosen. In that respect a distinction is made between *agreement* features and *lexical* features, with the former playing a more important role than the latter.

In paper 1 the distinction between lexical features and agreement features does not play a significant role, but it is highly important in paper 2 (cf. below). On the other hand, a distinction which does play a significant role in paper 1, but which is not addressed in paper 2 (nor in paper 3), is the one between 'functional' and 'substantive' elements. The basic intuition behind the latter distinction is that there exist elements (roughly words and word level formatives) which do not contribute any substantial denotative information to the referring expression, but which nevertheless have a semantic import. Thus understood the distinction serves to categorize articles as functional elements whereas other constituents in the noun phrase are substantive elements.

The distinction becomes highly relevant in connection with a principle termed the 'Availability Principle'. This principle claims that substantive elements can never be merged post-lexically whereas functional elements may, albeit only one for each given phrase structural object. An important effect of the principle is that it claims that articles must be used whenever they will be better identifiers for a functional category than any other element in a given numeration.

Given this effect, a central testing ground for the theory is to consider article systems, and this is done in section 4 where the subsections address: (i) the question why definite and indefinite articles do not co-occur, (ii) cross-linguistic differences with respect to the existence of articles, (iii) the lack of an obligatory plural indefinite article in languages like English, (iv) the French article system which has both an obligatory plural indefinite article and a partitive article, (v) the article system of northern and north-eastern Swedish dialects which have a partitive article that is homophonous with the suffixed definite article, (vi) Finnish which lacks articles altogether but where case alternation in certain syntactic contexts plays a role similar to that of articles in other languages. The conclusion is that Identification Theory sheds considerable light on the empirical questions that arise, and that it is capable of handling them by appealing to the feature specifications of the various articles found in the languages.

After the discussion of article systems a short intermezzo follows where I address certain correlations between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses and noun phrase types (section 5). The discussion reveals that there is a certain affinity between on the one

hand countability and restrictive relative clauses, and, on the other, between specificity and non-restrictive relative clauses. Since countability and specificity in turn are associated with the presence of the functional categories ν and δ, respectively, the absence of the two types of relatives serves as a diagnostic for the absence of the functional categories with which they are associated. This is exploited in later sections.

The paper then proceeds to discuss other definite determiners than the definite article (section 6), and I show that definite determiners may be present in noun phrases which are not uniquely referring. Nevertheless, a common trait of such non-unique noun phrases containing definite determiners appears to be that they are unambiguously specific. One case addressed in that respect is the phenomenon of indefinite-*this* in English, and I consider the possibility of treating this element as a 'specific article', i.e. as a functional rather than a substantive element, and thus an element which *must* be merged in certain contexts.

Another instance of a non-unique but specific noun phrase type containing a definite determiner is the so-called 'intensifying noun phrase' in Norwegian. Apart from its interesting referential properties (given its grammatical form), this noun phrase type also exhibits certain interesting restrictions pertaining to its internal syntax: neither cardinal determiners nor restrictive relatives are allowed to occur, and these two facts are both argued to follow from the (semantically plausible) absence of the functional category ν (cf. above).

The diagnostic established on the basis of correlations between relative clauses and functional categories is further exploited in connection with certain observations concerning universally quantifying determiners in Norwegian: the determiner *hver* 'each' is special in that it may co-occur with both indefinite and definite adjectival inflection—the determiner *enhver* '(free choice) any' can only co-occur with indefinite adjectives, and *alle* 'all' co-occurs with indefinite inflection unless a definite determiner is also present in the noun phrase.

Interestingly, when *hver* co-occurs with definite adjectives, non-restrictive relatives are allowed to occur. However, they are not allowed to occur when the determiner co-occurs with indefinite adjectives. The latter situation always holds for noun phrases containing *enhver*—in such noun phrases neither definite adjectives nor non-restrictive relatives are allowed. These facts are accounted for by attributing to *hver* and *enhver* differing morphological feature specifications according to which *hver* but not *enhver* is a suitable identifier for δ.

In section 7 of paper 1 the theory developed and discussed for noun phrases is extended to the clausal domain. The basic view in that respect is that I argue that clausal functional projections, just like noun phrase internal functional projections, are headed by abstract functional categories. A specific claim in that respect is that I take the functional projection TP, headed by the abstract functional category τ, to be absent from infintivals.

This view is highly unorthodox on standard accounts, but a conceptually plausible one given the general approach to the correlation between functional categories and semantics, and in order to illustrate the theory, I consider and discuss a certain difference

between Icelandic and Mainland Scandinavian control infinitivals which constitutes a problem for standard accounts. The difference is that Icelandic exhibits verb-movement in such infinitivals whereas Mainland Scandinavian does not, and this parallels the situation found in embedded clauses in the languages. The problem for standard accounts is that the verb movement present in Icelandic, but absent in Mainland Scandinavian, is taken to be movement to AgrS, but this functional category is in turn taken to be absent from (control) infinitivals. On the other hand, the functional category T is normally assumed to be present in the control infintivals.

Based on the general approach to functional categories that I assume, I redefine the functional categories in question on semantic grounds so that σ, the equivalent of AgrS, but not τ, the equivalent of T, is present in control infinitivals. Provided that the verb carries the same morphological features relevant for identification of σ in both control infinitivals and (embedded) finite clauses, which I argue to be the case, the difference between the languages with respect to verb movement can be taken to follow for the same reasons in both clause types.

The application of the theory to the clausal domain is highly sketchy in paper 1, but the discussion in section 7 provides an important bridge to paper 3 where the theory is applied to an analysis of Icelandic expletive constructions in particular, but also to certain cross-linguistic differences pertaining to the existence of expletive constructions in general (cf. below).

All in all paper 1 states quite clearly the overall goals of theory, and it provides a number of results worthy of consideration.

3. 'IDENTIFICATION' AND THE ROLE OF MORPHOLOGY IN THE SCANDINAVIAN NOUN PHRASE

The second paper, '"Identification" and the role of morphology in the Scandinavian noun phrase', has a more defined empirical goal than paper 1, and this goal is to account for a variety of crossdialectal syntactic differences in the Scandinavian noun phrase. In that respect it is especially concerned with article systems and possessive constructions, but it also touches on other issues—the status of demonstratives is a natural topic since there is a clear and obvious affinity between demonstratives and definite articles.

Nevertheless, paper 2 also addresses aspects of Identification Theory that are not discussed in paper 1, and in particular it considers certain issues of a more particular syntactic nature more carefully than the first paper: it states how agreement is to be handled within the theory, and it gives more elaborate and specific syntactic analyses of phrase structures and movements.

Moreover, although, as noted above, the Availability Principle is not addressed in paper 2, the paper introduces another important principle not considered in paper 1. This principle is termed the 'Uniqueness restriction on Agreement Features' ('UAF'), and it states that only one constituent occupying a position within the projection of a functional

category may carry an agreement feature relevant for the identification of that functional category. An example is the agreement feature [gen] ('gender') which is assumed to be relevant for identifying δ: the UAF bars for instance a configuration where both an X^0 adjoined to δ and an XP in Spec-DP carry this feature (i.e. overt gender marking).

As section 5 of paper 2 makes evident the UAF serves to explain why a variety of Swedish dialects, unlike most other Scandinavian dialects, allow prenominal possessives to precede definite articles: in the dialects in question either the possessives or the definite articles, or both, lack gender agreement, and a similar situation does not hold in Scandinavian more generally.

With respect to the Scandinavian article system the following four questions are addressed: (i) why is there an obligatory indefinite article in Mainland Scandinavian and Faroese but not in Icelandic?, (ii) why is there no preadjectival definite article in Icelandic, whereas there is in Mainland Scandinavian and Faroese?, (iii) why is the Danish preadjectival definite article in complementary distribution with the suffixed one, whereas the two articles co-occur in Faroese, Norwegian, and Swedish? (iv) why do northern Swedish dialects have adjective incorporation in definite noun phrases? The answers to these questions are roughly as follows.

Icelandic does not have an obligatory indefinite article because singular nouns in this dialect carry a feature relevant for identification of δ—more specifically, unlike nouns in other dialects, Icelandic nouns carry a case affix with number marking.

The absence of a preadjectival definite article in Icelandic is taken to follow from the fact that definite adjectives in this dialect, unlike other dialects, are inflected for gender, and therefore carry a feature ([gen]) relevant for the identification of δ—having a preadjectival definite article is then viewed as an alternative way of meeting the identification requirement on δ in the dialects where adjectives do not carry the feature in question.

The preadjectival article is claimed to have the same syntactic status as demonstratives, and the difference between Danish and the other dialects with a preadjectival definite article with respect to co-occurrence of the suffixed and preadjectival definite articles is claimed to follow from the general properties of demonstratives in the dialects: since Danish demonstratives cannot co-occur with the suffixed definite article, neither can the preadjectival definite article. In turn, why demonstratives may or may not co-occur with the suffixed definite article, hinges on the status of the suffixed article in the dialects.[1]

The reason why northern Swedish dialects have adjective incoporation in definite noun phrases is also claimed to be related to the general properties of demonstratives in the dialect—unlike in other dialects the demonstratives lack nominal features, being homophonous to deictic adverbs, and a preadjectival article with the same properties as demonstratives would therefore not be suitable as an identifier of δ.

[1] The suffixed definite article is argued to be a syntactic clitic in Danish and Icelandic, separately listed in the lexicon, and an inflectional element in the other dialects. This differing status is in turn exploited so as to say that only the inflectional variety of the suffixed definite article may co-occur with demonstratives.

Several problems arise given these general accounts of the cross-dialectal differences in the article system. For one thing, the reason why Northern Swedish does not have a preadjectival definite article is far from obvious since there do exist demonstratives with nominal features in the dialect, more specifically when demonstratives are pronominal, i.e. the single constituent of a noun phrase. In certain Swedish dialects adjacent to the northern Swedish ones, the dialects of Österbotten in Finland, the etymological equivalent of such pronominal demonstratives are used both as preadjectival articles and as (adnominal) demonstratives more generally. Moreover, the Österbotten dialects also exhibit adjective incorporation to a certain extent, and it is therefore not obvious why the two dialect groups differ in that Northern Swedish generally employs adjective incorporation whereas the Österbotten dialects employ a preadjectival article.

In that respect I develop the notion of 'generalized strategy' which essentially claims that when there in principle exists more than one option for meeting the identification requirement of a functional category, the grammar must choose one of them as the strategy to be employed most generally. On that account, Northern Swedish and the Österbotten dialects have chosen different 'generalized strategies' with respect to adjective incorporation versus the use of a pronominal demonstrative to meet the identification of δ,

The notion of 'generalized strategy' is crucial also for understanding the many other problems that arise given the general approach where the role of visible morphology is assigned a significant role when determining what features the various elements in a numeration have. The problems are among others the following.

First, Faroese patterns syntactically with Mainland Scandinavian with respect to both the obligatory (singular) indefinite article and the preadjectival definite article. However, in terms of case morphology on nouns and gender morphology on adjectives Faroese seems to pattern with Icelandic rather than with Mainland Scandinavian.

Second, The Swedish dialect spoken on the island of Gotland patterns with the northern and eastern Swedish dialects which allow prenominal possessives to precede definite articles although gender agreement is found on both articles and possessives.

Third, in all Scandinavian dialects there exist possessives which do not show any gender agreement, but these possessives are nevertheless not allowed to precede definite articles.

In order to account for these problems without giving up my theory, I claim that morphology does not play a direct role in syntax. Rather it serves as one of potentially several factors relevant when parameters of a grammar for a language/dialect are set, more specifically when the choice of generalized strategies is made. In that respect, I show that in all the problematic cases mentioned one may appeal to some notion of 'richness of morphology': although standard written Faroese exhibits rich nominal inflection quite on a par with Icelandic, that situation does not hold for spoken Faroese; although possessives and articles show gender agreement in the Gotland dialect there are considerably fewer oppositions than in for example Standard Swedish; and although all Scandinavian dialects have some possessives which do not agree in gender, the majority of possessives do show such agreement (in most dialects). Thus it seems that the overall agreement properties of

classes of constituents/elements decides whether the morphological properties are syntactically relevant or not.

All in all I believe that the paper represents a worthy contribution to the study of the Scandinavian noun phrase. It gives an adequate coverage of a range of empirical facts, in part facts which earlier either have not been known (i.e. for syntacticians/generative linguists) or alternatively not been found problematic (i.e. for traditional grammarians). Putting these issues on the agenda should therefore be important in itself. Moreover, I believe that paper 2 shows that Identification Theory provides a solid basis for understanding the empirical facts.

The empirical issues addressed in paper 2 in turn of course shed light on Identification Theory, and the paper represents an important and natural extension of paper 1 both because of its theoretical contribution and because both of the two papers are predominantly concerned with the structure of the noun phrase.

4. ICELANDIC EXPLETIVE CONSTRUCTIONS AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECT TYPES

In the third paper in the collection, 'Icelandic expletive constructions and the distribution of subject types' ('paper 3), I consider empirical issues that differ from those in the other two papers. Like paper 2 this paper also has a strong empirical orientation in that its overall goal is to discuss and account for certain specific linguistic phenomena, and again the phenomena represent facts either not known or not problematized in earlier work. Expletive constructions have been much debated within syntactic theory of the last decade, and it has been a central topic within the development of Minimalism. As I show, the empirical facts observed and addressed in paper 3 have important consequences for analyses of expletive constructions offered in the literature, and moreover, I develop an alternative account which relies heavily on Identification Theory. Hence, I claim that the paper represents an important contribution to the understanding of expletive constructions, both because of its presentation of new and relevant data and because of the theoretical solutions it offers.

The central novel observation is that the associate noun phase (or 'logical subject', henceforth 'the associate') of Icelandic expletive constructions may be universally quantifying when occurring in a position between the finite and the non-finite verb, termed 'the intermediate position'. However, when it occurs in a position to the right of the non-finite verb, i.e. VP-internally, it cannot be universally quantifying. Definite noun phrases are barred from occurrence in both positions unless it is embedded under a universal quantifier—in the latter case it may occur in the intermediate position (hence a noun phrase like *the cats* is barred from occurrence in both positions whereas a noun phrase like *all the cats* may occur in the intermediate position, but not in the postverbal position). The fact that neither universally quantifying nor definite noun phrases may occur in the postverbal position of expletive constructions is well-known from a variety of languages, and the

restriction is known in the literature as either the 'Definiteness Restriction' or the 'Definiteness Effect'.

In languages like English and Mainland Scandinavian, the associate of expletive constructions may only occur in the postverbal, VP-internal position, and not in a position between the finite and the non-finite verb as in Icelandic. This may have been a factor which has contributed to the failure of observing that the Definiteness Effect is not equally strong in the intermediate position—presumably noone thought of checking the semantic properties of associates in this position more carefully. However, the observation is obviously important, and I argue that the evidence from Icelandic has two major theoretical consequences.

First , it suggests that one particularly influential account of the Definiteness Effect offered in the generative literature cannot be correct. Several authors suggest that the Definiteness Effect is triggered by the presence of the expletive, more specifically through coindexation, binding, or Case-transmission between the expletive and the associate. This idea was developed in the eighties within the framework of Government and Binding Theory, and implicitly assumed in Chomsky's (1995) Minimalist Program. Although the details of the analyses differ, the problem is the same for all of them: they cannot account for the fact that there is a difference between the postverbal and the intermediate position of Icelandic expletive constructions with respect to the semantic properties that the associate is allowed to have.

Second, given that we reject the idea that the expletive triggers the Definiteness Effect, we need to reconsider another idea concerning expletive-associate constructions which has been advocated within the generative literature, in particular within Minimalism, namely the claim that the associate raises to the position of the expletive at the level of Logical Form. As long as the expletive is not the source for the Definiteness Effect, and as long as there are no semantic restrictions on subjects of non-expletive constructions (which then occur *overtly* in the position of the expletive), I find the idea of associate raising at LF difficult to maintain since it provides us with no understanding as to why there is a Definiteness Effect in expletive constructions. However, a remaining argument for LF-raising of the associate is that it accounts for why the associate agrees with the finite verb—if the associate raises to a spec-head configuration with the finite verb at LF, the agreement facts are unproblematic.

The alternative account that I develop is partly based on theoretical suggestions offered in the literature and, ultimately, on my own Identification Theory. First of all I suggest that the Definiteness Effect should be accounted for by a certain understanding of Case theory which makes no reference to the presence of expletives and where the Case assigned to universally quantifying noun phrases may be checked in the intermediate position. On the assumption, which is later motivated (cf. below), that the Icelandic expletive does not carry Case, and thus does not need to check Case in the intermediate position, this position is available for the associate in Icelandic but not in other languages. In other languages, such as English and Mainland Scandinavian, the expletive carries

Case, and needs to check the Case in the intermediate position, thus rendering the position unavailable for the associate.

Moreover, I propose that subject/verb agreement should not be captured as a necessary local relation between the subject (or associate) in the overt position of the finite verb, but rather as a relation which may obtain more globally within phrasal objects that constitute one and the same extended projection, and agreement is therefore not an argument for maintaining LF-raising of the associate. (This view of agreement is more fully expressed in paper 2.)

Furthermore, the identification of σ plays a crucial role in the analysis I develop. This functional category heads AgrSP, and its extensional function is to provide an anchoring of the subject with respect to the state-of-affairs denoted by the verb. The features relevant for identification of σ are [Case] (found on XPs, in effect noun phrases) and [person] (found on verbs) and [deixis] (potentially found in both XPs and verbs). In that respect I capitalize on a suggestion in the literature to the effect that a distinction between two types of subject/verb agreement must be recognized; one involving both an interpretable feature ([deixis], found in Null Subject languages) as well as an uninterpretable agreement feature ([person]), and one involving only the latter uninterpretable feature (i.e. the system of e.g. Icelandic). Both types of subject/verb agreement render a verb suitable for identification of σ, the functional category heading AgrSP, but only the interpretable feature provides an anchoring for the subject with respect to the state-of-affairs denoted by the verb.

Such subject anchoring is required, and it represents an alternative conception of the well-known 'Extended Projection Principle' ('EPP') which basically claims that all clauses must have a subject. However, in its strictest sense the requirement for subject anchoring is only assumed to apply to definite subjects (which carry the feature [deixis])—in the case of non-definite subjects only a default subject anchoring is required, and for such anchoring to obtain it is sufficient that some element containing either the feature [deix] or the feature [Case] occupy Spec-AgrSP. The Mainland Scandinavian expletive contains both of these features, and the Icelandic expletive the feature [deixis], and in both languages the presence of an expletive thus suffices to meet the requirement for default subject anchoring.

Now, the notion 'generalized strategy', as conceived of and presented in paper 2, plays an important role also in the analysis developed in paper 3. This is evident in connection with the explanation I give for why only the Mainland Scandinavian expletive (and not the Icelandic one) carries Case. As mentioned above this assumed difference accounts for the fact that the intermediate position is available for the Icelandic associate but not for the Mainland Scandinavian one.

The arguments I provide for the differing status of the expletive hinges on the strategies employed for identifying σ. In Icelandic the identification requirement is always met through verb movement and the feature [person] on the verb. In Mainland Scandinavian, on the other hand, the identification of σ is always met through XP-movement to Spec-AgrSP, and since the identifying noun phrase in non-expletive constructions will always carry [Case], but not necessarily [deixis] (i.e. not if the noun phrase is indefinite), I

conjecture that identification of σ by the feature [Case] is recognized as the 'generalized strategy' in Mainland Scandinavian. In turn, the Mainland Scandinavian expletive,being the identifier of σ in *expletive* constructions, is analyzed as carrying this feature too.

5. CONCLUSION

As this presentation should have made clear, there is a clear thematic relationship between the three papers. They all either address or rely heavily on Identification Theory, and they all contribute to developing it through the important and interesting theoretical results they provide. There is a certain overlap between the papers, especially between papers 1 and 2, mainly because both papers present the basic traits of the theory more fully than paper 3, but the overlap is not overwhelmingly redundant and the separate contribution of each paper is significant.

The clearest thematic relationship is between paper 1 and paper 2 since they both predominantly address issues pertaining to noun phrase syntax. Paper 3 also addresses issues concerning noun phrases, but then first and foremost their syntactic behavior at the clausal level and not their internal structure. Another aspect distinguishing paper 3 from the other two is that it relates more clearly to an ongoing and specific theoretical discussion within the framework of Minimalism. To a somewhat greater extent the other two papers define their own agenda, but the discussion of the role of morphology in paper 2 of course touches on core issues of Minimalism.

Although paper 3 addresses other empirical issues than the first two papers, the discussion in section 7 of paper 1 represents an important link to the analytical part of paper 3, both because both parts of the thesis address clause level differences between Icelandic and Mainland Scandinavian and because they discuss how Identification Theory can be exploited at the clausal level. Although the thesis does not provide a full-fledged presentation of Identification Theory applied to clausal syntax, the two parts together give a fairly intelligible sketch.

The application of the notion of 'generalized strategy' in paper 3 moreover provides a clear thematic link between paper 2 and paper 3. In that respect, it should be noted that the notion is also implicitly assumed in various discussions in paper 1, in particular in several speculative diachronic notes as well as in section 7 (which discusses control infinitivals in Scandinavian, cf. above).

All in all I am of the opinion that the three papers in this collection should offer a comprehensive theoretical contribution to the study of syntax and to the interaction between syntax and semantics.

REFERENCES

Chomsky, Noam: 1970, 'Remarks on nominalization', in Jacobs, R.A. og Peter S. Rosenbaum (red.), *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*. Ginn & Co, Waltham, 184–221.

Chomsky, Noam: 1986, *Knowledge of Language: its nature, origin, and use*, Praeger, New York.

Chomsky, Noam: 1988, *Language and problems of knowledge*, MIT Press, Cambridge.

Chomsky, Noam: 1995a, *The Minimalist Program*, MIT Press, Cambridge.

Chomsky, Noam: 1995b, 'Language and nature', *Mind* **104**, 1–61.

Chomsky, Noam: 1998, 'Minimalist inquiries: the framework', *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* **15**.

Haegeman, Liliane: 1991, *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory*,Blackwell, Oxford.

Jackendoff, R. 1977: *X'-syntax.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Nordgård, T. & T.A. Åfarli. 1990: *Generativ syntaks: Ei innføring via norsk*. Novus, Oslo.

Platzack, Christer: 1998, *Svenskans inre grammatik – det minimalistiska programmet: en introduktion till modern generativ grammatik* , Studentlitteratur, Lund.

Pollock, Jean-Yves: 1989, 'Verb movement, Universal Grammar, and the structure of IP, *Linguistic Inquiry* **20**, 365–424.

Riemsdijk, Henk van and Edwin Williams: 1986, *Introduction to the Theory of Grammar*. MIT Press, Cambridge.

Webelhuth, Gert: 1995, *Government and Binding Theory and the Minimalist Program*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur: 1995, 'On the (non-)universality of functional categories', in Epstein, S. et al, *Minimal ideas: syntactic studies in the minimalist framework*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 253–281.