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1 Introduction

At a broad level, this dissertation looks at Voice phenomena that are between what is traditionally called active and passive and allows a further departure from a construction-based conception of grammar. The conception of passive in transformational syntax was a language-specific approach, deriving the passive from the active with a passive-specific transformation rule (Chomsky 1957, 1965). In the Extended Standard Theory (EST) and Government and Binding (GB) era (X'-theory), approaches in modelling grammar shifted from language-specific rules to general principles applying to language. Ambitious research was conducted on case and Voice phenomena, along with their interaction (Chomsky 1981; Vergnaud 1977/2008; Jaeggli 1986; Baker et al. 1989). The Principles and Parameters approach, which has its roots in GB, is pursued further in Minimalism (Chomsky 1993, 1995, et seq.). In recent years, many important cross-linguistic observations and discoveries regarding Voice phenomena and case have been made. Yet, at the same time, the interaction between the two requires a much better understanding. This dissertation delves into how case and Voice are intertwined from the viewpoint of Icelandic, a case-rich language famous for exhibiting quirky case subjects. Icelandic has various different Voice structures where the interaction with case is often not what would

---
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have been expected. The phenomena researched here make us redefine what we often take for
granted when we talk about actives, passives, middles, etc., in language.

The generative literature on different Voice types, case and their interaction is vast, with
well-known problems such as accusative objects in the active being nominative in the passive.
Ever since the discovery of oblique case subjects in Icelandic (Andrews 1976, Thráinsson 1979,
Zaenen et al. 1985, H.Á. Sigurðsson 1989) and other languages, such as Faroese (Barnes 1986;
Thráinsson et al. 2004), the problems have become more interesting and challenging. In this
dissertation I provide new analyses for understudied constructions in Icelandic that provide
important insights into the intersection of Voice and case. The focus is on the interaction of
syntax and morphology, on the one hand, and syntax and semantics, on the other.

The dissertation contemplates what counts as, e.g., a passive construction and challenges
traditional views, arriving at the conclusion that the boundaries are in some cases much more
vague than often believed, between, say, active and passive constructions. Surely, even though
passives are often described as demoting the agent (Comrie 1977), that is not enough. As has
become evident in recent years in various constructions, not even passive morphology and struc-
tural accusative to nominative case alternation is required (e.g., Maling and Sigurjónsdóttir
2002).²

1.1 The framework

In the present system, I adopt basic insights and theoretical assumptions from Distributed
Morphology (e.g., Halle and Marantz 1993, Embick 2010) and Minimalism (e.g., Chomsky
1995, 2001, 2008, 2013), where syntax is the locus of the generative derivation; it feeds mor-
phology/phonology and semantics. The following diagram captures this.

(1) Numeration
    | Syntax
    | Spell-Out
       \_____/ MC LF
         \   \
          \   PF

After syntax, at spell-out, the derivation is sent to PF (Phonological Form) and LF
(Logical Form). On the PF branch, before the derivation reaches phonological rules, MC
(Morphological Component) works on the derivation.

²For a recent attempt to define passives, see Bruening and Tran (2015), who define passives as a demotion
or existential binding of an external argument.
The terminal nodes in syntax are morphemes, where a morpheme is either an acategorical root (generally corresponding to lexical categories) or a functional head that is a bundle of grammatical features. The morphemes do not have phonological content in syntax; after syntax, the structure is sent to PF and LF for phonological realization and interpretation, respectively. The pieces sent to morphology (phonology) are realized (phonological material is added to them) by a special operation of insertion of Vocabulary items. This takes place late in the derivation (called late insertion), after other morphological operations, such as impoverishment, fusion and fission (Noyer 1992; Halle and Marantz 1993, 1994; Halle 1997), lowering, linearization and local dislocation (Embick and Noyer 2001; Embick 2007).

For semantics, I assume the basic semantic compositional mechanisms Function Application and Predicate Modification.

(2) **Function Application** (Heim and Kratzer 1998:44)
If \( \alpha \) is a branching node, \( \{ \beta, \gamma \} \) is the set of \( \alpha \)'s daughters, and \([\beta]\) is a function whose domain contains \([\gamma]\), then \([\alpha] = [\beta][\gamma] \).

(3) **Predicate Modification** (adapted from Heim and Kratzer 1998:65)
If \( \alpha \) is a branching node, \( \{ \beta, \gamma \} \) is the set of \( \alpha \)'s daughters, and \( \beta \) and \( \gamma \) are both of type \( \langle e, st \rangle \), then \( \alpha \) is of type \( \langle e, st \rangle \).

I also assume Kratzer’s (1996) Event Identification.

(4) **Event Identification** (adapted from Kratzer 1996:122)
If \( \alpha \) is a branching node, \( \{ \beta, \gamma \} \) is the set of \( \alpha \)'s daughters, and \( \beta \) is of type \( \langle e, st \rangle \) and \( \gamma \) is of type \( \langle s, t \rangle \), then \( \alpha \) is of type \( \langle e, st \rangle \).

Finally, Chung and Ladusaw (2004) introduce another mode of composition, predicate restriction (Restrict). Restrict targets an argument but, importantly, does not saturate it.

(5) **Restrict** (adapted from Legate 2014:39)
If \( \alpha \) is a branching node, \( \{ \beta, \gamma \} \) is the set of \( \alpha \)'s daughters, and \( \beta \) is of type \( \langle e, st \rangle \) and \( \gamma \) is of type \( \langle e, t \rangle \), then \( \alpha \) is of type \( \langle e, st \rangle \).

When Voice introduces an argument via Event Identification, that argument can be saturated by a DP in SpecVoiceP via Function Application. In some cases, a bundle of \( \phi \)-features, lacking \( D \), may occupy the argument position, without saturating it. This is an important mode of composition for the analysis of the New Impersonal Passive (Legate 2014), the progressive passive and the reflexive passive.
1.2 Voice and implicit arguments

As argued by Marantz (1984) and Kratzer (1996), an external argument is not part of a verb’s argument structure. Rather, a dedicated functional head *introduces* it. However, in various languages, including English, it is not straightforward to determine, in addition to lexical VP or \( \sqrt{P} \), how many functional heads we need within the verb phrase. We usually see either VoiceP (e.g., Kratzer 1996) or \( vP \) (e.g., Chomsky 1995), or both (Harley 2013, Legate 2014). Harley 2013, accounting for high applicatives in Hiaki, and Legate (2014), accounting for Voice phenomena in Acehnese, argue convincingly that both Voice and \( v \) are needed. My account of the progressive passive, see §2.2, provides additional evidence for the distinction between Voice and \( v \).

This dissertation studies the interaction of Voice and implicit arguments. Landau (2010) proposes a distinction between Strong Implicit Arguments (SIA) and Weak Implicit Arguments (WIA). SIAs are pro/PRO which consist of a D-feature and \( \phi \)-features (DP). WIAs, on the other hand, only consist of a \( \phi \)-bundle (\( \phi P \)). Legate (2014) analyses the New Impersonal Passive (NIP) in Icelandic as having a WIA in SpecVoiceP. I extend that analysis to the progressive passive and the Impersonal Modal Construction (IMC) in Icelandic.

I explore the nature of weak arguments in the dissertation. Landau (2010) argues that the D-feature is crucial for secondary predication and binding of anaphors. However, even though the WIA of the NIP is incompatible with a secondary predicate, binding of anaphors is grammatical. That is in need of explanation. Landau proposes that WIAs are always projected in the syntax. I challenge that in the dissertation and argue that only sometimes are WIAs syntactically projected.

When we discuss implicit arguments in a language like Icelandic, they are usually an external argument (syntactically projected or not) introduced by Voice. They are implicit, not pronounced. However, I argue that there are cases of overtly realized weak arguments, that is, Weak Explicit Arguments (WEA). I argue that the simplex reflexive pronoun of inherently and naturally reflexive verbs is a WEA. I furthermore argue that all weak arguments, implicit and explicit, are assigned case. They cannot move and, moreover, block A-movement of a lower argument.

Now we will take a closer look at the interaction of implicit arguments and Voice. On the present approach, we need four types of Voice to be able to account for different Voice phenomena (cf. also Embick 2004b, Schäfer 2008, Legate 2014, Alexiadou et al. 2015, Wood 2015a):³

---

³Various accounts take anticausatives to contain less verbal structure than causatives. My account is, however, closer to, e.g., Alexiadou et al. (2015) where causatives and anticausatives have equally rich verbal structure (event decomposition), but the difference between them is different Voice types.
The features on Voice mean that it either introduces an external argument (Ext) or not (∅) and that it either requires its specifier to be filled (Spec) or not (∅). What these four tree structures indicate is the following. In (6a), the external argument (Ext) is introduced in Voice which also specifies a requirement of having its specifier filled (Spec); SpecVoiceP can be occupied by a DP, φP (WIA) or a clitic. Interestingly, this type of Voice is compatible with the active (7a), where a DP in SpecVoiceP saturates the external argument position, the New Impersonal Passive (NIP) and the progressive passive (7b), and the modal -st passive (7c).

   Jón.NOM investigated the. Bible.ACC
   ‘Jón studied the Bible.’

b. Það er verið að rannsaka Bibliúna af fræðimönnum.
   EXPL is been to investigate the. Bible.ACC by scholars
   ‘The Bible is being studied by scholars.’

c. Biblían á að rannsaka-st af fræðimönnum.
   the. Bible. NOM ought to read-ST by scholars
   ‘The Bible ought to be studied by scholars.’

(7b–c) have the same Voice type as the active (7a) even though (7b–c) have passive properties. I adopt Wood’s (2015a) analysis of -st being a clitic in SpecVoiceP. Voice that has -st in its specifier usually does not introduce an external argument; that is only grammatical if something above it, such as modals, is capable of existentially bind the external argument (making it like a passive). It should be noted that -st is not assigned case; Voice can therefore not assign accusative to its object in (7c). For the progressive passive, I argue that Voice introduces an

---

5The following abbreviations are used in the glosses in this proposal: 1 = 1st person, 2 = 2nd person, 3 = 3rd person, ACC = accusative, ACT = active, ADJ = adjectivizer, DAT = dative, EXPL = expletive, F = feminine, INF = infinitive, M = masculine, N = neuter, NOM = nominative, PASS = passive, PL = plural, PRF = perfect, REFL = reflexive, SBJV = subjunctive, ST = -st morphology.
external argument with a \( \phi \)-bundle in its specifier. This \( \phi \)P does not saturate the argument position which makes ‘by’-phrases possible. \( \phi \)Ps in SpecVoiceP are assigned structural case and therefore Voice assigns structural accusative case to the object.

(6b) introduces an agent but the specifier of VoiceP must be empty. I argue that this is the Voice head of the canonical passive (CanP). As is well known, CanP contains an implicit argument (WIA). I argue that it is not projected, however.

\[
\begin{align*}
(8) & \quad \text{a. Bækurnar voru lesnar.} & \quad \text{b. Leikjunum var frestað.} \\
& \quad \text{the.books.NOM were read.NOM} & \quad \text{the.games.DAT was postponed} \\
& \quad \text{‘The books were read.’} & \quad \text{‘The games were postponed.’}
\end{align*}
\]

WIA\(s\) that are not projected in the syntax are not assigned case. Since the external argument in CanP is not syntactically projected, structural accusative is not assigned, see (8a). Dative and genitive cases are preserved in CanP, however, see (8b). Furthermore, I argue that the reflexive passive (ReflPass) also has the Voice type in (6). An example is given in (9b).

\[
\begin{align*}
(9) & \quad \text{a. Svo var drifið sig á ball.} \\
& \quad \text{then was hurried.DFLT REFL on dance} \\
& \quad \text{‘Then there was hurrying off to a dance.’}
\end{align*}
\]

I propose that the reflexive pronoun in (9) is an overtly realized \( \phi \)P, a WEA, see §2.3. Even though \textit{sig} has the form of an accusative case I will argue that \textit{sig} is actually not accusative case, but nominative.

Next, the Voice type in (6c) does not introduce an external argument but requires that its specifier position be filled. This is compatible with so-called Fate Accusatives (FatAcc). Adopting Wood’s (2015c) analysis, I argue that FatAcc involve a silent clitic, generated in SpecVoiceP, that is assigned structural case.

\[
\begin{align*}
(10) & \quad \text{Bátinn braut í spón.} \\
& \quad \text{the.boat.ACC broke to pieces} \\
& \quad \text{‘The boat broke to pieces.’} \\
& \quad \text{(H.Á. Sigurðsson 1989:276)}
\end{align*}
\]

This construction does not introduce an external argument, however.

Finally, without going into any details, the Voice type in (6d) does neither introduce an argument nor have anything in its specifier.

To be able to assign structural accusative case, a VoiceP of the type in (6a) is usually needed (e.g., in the progressive passive, discussed in §2.2), whereas Voice type (6b) is sufficient for the preservation of non-structural case (such as in the canonical passive); this type is never compatible with structural accusative. In addition, I propose that (6c) is compatible with both accusative and dative case assignment, as long as SpecVoiceP receives structural case.
Voice type (6d), on the other hand, is neither able to assign structural accusative nor dative or genitive. I will not discuss this type further here.

I follow Wood’s (2015a) analysis of -st (in middles, anticausatives) being a clitic generated in SpecVoiceP. Case is not preserved in -st marked middles and anticausatives:

(11) a. Ég týndi úrinu.
    I.NOM lost the.watch.DAT
    ‘I lost the watch.’

b. Úrið týndi-st.
    the.watch.NOM lost-ST
    ‘The watch got lost.’

In (11b), Voice does not introduce an external argument (agent) and its Spec position is filled by a clitic that is not assigned structural case. Wood argues that -st impoverishes v_{DAT} such that it cannot assign dative case. However, when Voice introduces an agent role and has -st merge in its specifier, nominative is not fully grammatical.

(12) a. Við skilðum umsóknunum.
    we handed.in the.applications.DAT
    ‘We handed in the applications.’

b. ??Umsóknir skilist hand.in.28. mars.
    applications.NOM hand.in.SBJV before 28 March
    ‘Applications should be handed in before March 28th.’ (Ottósson 1986:112)

Dative is not perfect here either, and speakers vary regarding whether they like the nominative or the dative version better. Accusative case is, on the other hand, never assigned under these same circumstances. That is, when a verb that assigns structural case to its object is both -st marked (the clitic being in SpecVoiceP) and has an (unprojected) external argument, structural accusative case is not assigned. I take this to suggest that when an external argument is introduced by Voice, then dative case can be assigned, but that is not enough for accusative to be assigned.

There are instances of accusative and dative assignment, discussed in Chapter 3, where neither an external argument is introduced, nor is SpecVoiceP overtly filled. For these, I will pursue a silent clitic account, making them of type (6c). Although it’s stipulative, on this account, the clitic is assigned structural case (cf. Wood 2015c). I propose in that accusative case assignment depends on an element in SpecVoiceP being assigned structural case. Dative case requires either an element in SpecVoiceP to be assigned structural case or an external argument.

On the approach here, unlike, e.g., H.Á. Sigurðsson 2011, 2012, there are no flavors of Voice, such as Voice_{ACT}, Voice_{PASS}, Voice_{EXPL}, but simply an interaction of Voice and what specifications it has (Ext, Spec, ∅).
1.3 Case

On my approach, case features are checked in the syntax but realized post-syntactically, in the morphological component (cf. Legate 2008) using a dependent case algorithm (Marantz 1991, McFadden 2004). My account differs from a typical dependent case analysis in that case features are checked in syntax so case is not a pure PF phenomenon (cf. Preminger 2011).

1.3.1 Dependent case

Dependent case was originally formulated by Marantz (1991) such that case realization obeys a hierarchy where more specific requirements are selected over more general requirements. On that hierarchy lexically governed case is the most specific, followed by dependent case (accusative in a nominative/accusative system), unmarked case and default case, respectively. Accusative (dependent case) is assigned by “V+I to one argument in opposition to another argument position”; the argument’s case is dependent on properties of another DP position, also governed by V+I (Marantz 1991:24). A more recent version of dependent case, as formulated by Wood (2011:8), is presented below:

(13) If a DP α has no case feature at spellout, it is assigned accusative iff there is some other DP α′ which is visible to α and where (a) α′ has no case feature and (b) α′ c-commands α. Otherwise, α will be nominative.

That is, if two DPs are in the same dependency, or domain, and one of them does not get inherent or quirky case, one of these DPs, the highest structural case argument, will get unmarked case (nominative in a nom/acc system) and the other one will receive dependent case (accusative in a nom/acc system). The version above assumes that non-structural case is determined before spellout. That is, dependent case accounts for structural cases, nominative and accusative, in the same dependency.

1.3.2 Syntactic dependent case approach

I argue that case assignment is a reflex of syntactic Agree but the translation into case features (dependent, unmarked) occurs in the morphological component. Finally, case realization is morphological, taking place at Vocabulary Insertion. Whether an argument bearing structural case receives accusative or nominative depends on whether there is another argument in the same domain that also has a structural case.

Following Heck and Müller (2007), Müller (2010) (see also Poole 2015), I assume that the syntactic derivation is driven by two types of features: \([*F*]\) and \([\bullet F\bullet]\). The first is a

\(^5\)For somewhat similar ideas, see Yip et al.’s (1987) Case in Tiers or H.Á. Sigurðsson’s (2003; 2006a) Sibling Correlation.
probe feature, triggering Agree; the second is a structure-building feature, triggering Merge and Move. Deviating a bit from Heck and Müller (2007), I assume that when case+φ probes, case on a DP is instantiated and the DP values the unvalued φ-features of the probe.

Heck and Müller (2007) assume that T and v bear structural case feature [case]: T bears [∗case:ext∗] which instantiates [case:ext] on a DP (which is nominative in NOM/ACC system) and v bears [∗case:int∗] which instantiates [case:int] (accusative) on a DP. I adopt this view but assume that T and Voice both bear [∗case:str*], i.e., structural case, which instantiates either nominative or accusative, depending on whether there is a structural case DP higher in the same dependency or not.

Below I discuss how inherent case and quirky case are assigned.

1.3.3 Quirky vs. inherent case

Icelandic is famous for having so-called oblique subjects (non-nominative subjects) (Andrews 1976; Thráinsson 1979; Zaenen et al. 1985; Sigurðsson 1989), which behave syntactically like nominative subjects, except that they do not trigger verbal agreement. This kind of subjects is often called ‘quirky subjects’, highlighting their ability to move to subject position, cf. McGinnis’s (1998) distinction into inert and quirky case, where the former cannot A-move but the latter can. Non-nominative subjects, such as in Icelandic, can structurally be divided into at least two types (e.g., Jónsson 2003, Woolford 2006). Even though both types can A-move to a derived subject position, I’m only calling one of them quirky: 1) Inherent case (indirect object case; Appl case), where the case, usually dative, is determined structurally in SpecApplP; and 2) quirky case, which is assigned by v with a dative or genitive diacritic.6

The difference between the two is shown below for the verb úthluta ‘allocate’, see (14), which takes two dative objects. Appl’ with a dative case structure-building feature discharges dative to a DP in SpecApplP, whereas $v_{dat}$ assigns dative to the direct object via Agree.

(14) Þeir úthlutuðu okkur velli til 12:00.

They allocated us.DAT field.DAT until 12:00

‘They allocated a field to us until 12:00.’ (Sigurðsson and Wood 2012:277)

6I follow Wood (2015a) in putting a dative or genitive feature on v (cf. also Svenonius 2006, Sigurðsson 2009, 2012) and calling it $v_{dat}$ and $v_{gen}$, respectively.
Here, Appl has two structure-building features. It requires a DP in its complement position and requires its specifier to be filled; the element in its specifier position will be assigned dative case upon Merge. $v_{\text{DAT}}$’s structure-building feature says it must merge with Appl. It also has a probe feature: when the case feature will probe, Agree relation is established between $v_{\text{DAT}}$ and the corresponding DP ($velli$), such that the DP is assigned dative case. Voice has two structure-building features. One requires it to merge with $v$, the other requires its specifier to be filled (this Voice type is compatible with (6a) above).

The difference between the two types of case becomes particularly clear when the verb above, úþluta ‘allocate’, is used with the -st marker (E.F. Sigurðsson and Wood 2012, Wood and E.F. Sigurðsson 2014b; also Alexiadou et al. 2014a), resulting in an anticausative structure. Then the indirect object stays dative, whereas the direct object becomes nominative case marked, see (16).

(16) Okkur úþlutaði-st völlur til 12:00.
us.DAT allocated-ST field.NOM until 12:00
‘We got allocated a field until 12:00.’

As Wood (2015a) points out, it is important that quirky dative case “gets its case in a different way” (p. 129) from inherent dative case. As before, the indirect dative comes from a structure-building feature on Appl. $v$ has a dative feature as before but since there is no element in SpecVoiceP that receives structural case, $v_{\text{DAT}}$ does not assign dative case.
Wood (2015a) proposes an impoverishment rule for -st, such that $v_{\text{DAT}}$ becomes $v$ in the vicinity of -st ($v_{\text{DAT}} \rightarrow v$ / [VoiceP -st Voice]). I propose that the impoverishment rule should be extended to Voice which does not introduce an external argument nor has its specifier filled by an element assigned structural case.

Comparing case assignment in Icelandic and Faroese is important. For many Faroese speakers, $v_{\text{DAT}}$ in the passive only assigns dative to its argument if the DP does not move. If it moves to SpecTP, then the DP is not assigned dative, but nominative.\(^7\)\(^8\)

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{Faroese}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Tað varð hjálpt einum manni.
\item Ein maður varð hjálptur.
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

I argue for a case stacking approach (e.g., Yoon 2004, Richards 2013; also Bacovcin 2015) to account for the Faroese data when T has a structural case EPP structure-building feature [●case:str●] (or a structural case feature with an EPP subfeature, cf. Pesetsky and Torrego 2001).

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{TP}
\item \textbf{DP}
\item \textbf{T}
\item \textbf{VoiceP}
\item \textbf{Voice}
\item \textbf{vP}
\item \textbf{$v_{\text{DAT}}$}
\item \textbf{⟨DP⟩}
\item \textbf{[*case:dat*]}
\end{enumerate}

The internal merge in SpecTP triggers Agree between T and the DP, such that the DP values T’s $\phi$-features. On this account, the moved DP receives two syntactic case features, dative

\(^7\)Thanks to Hjalmar Petersen, his students and Ragnar Sigrunarson for judgments on the examples in (17).

\(^8\)A similar pattern is found in Norwegian dialects that preserve dative morphology. The examples below represent the Halsa dialect (Åfarli and Fjosne 2012; Eythórsson et al. 2012)

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{i.} E hjælpt hánná i går.
\item \textbf{b.} Hainn/*Hánná vart hjælpt i går.
\item \textbf{I} helped him.DAT yesterday
\item \textbf{he.NOM/him.DAT} was helped yesterday
\item \textbf{(Åfarli and Fjosne 2012:85)}
\end{enumerate}

However, in the passive, it is not possible to see the case of an argument in situ with a verb that takes a dative direct object, as dative case only shows up on definite arguments, but only indefinite direct objects can stay in situ in the passive.
from \( v_{\text{dat}} \) and nominative from T.

In the passive of monotransitives in Faroese, where the DP originates as a direct object, dative is usually not preserved, whereas dative is usually preserved when it originates in SpecAppP (as an indirect object). This fits with the idea that we have to distinguish between inherent case and quirky case in Icelandic (see discussion above).

When the DP does not move, interestingly, dative is preserved, cf. (17a).

\[
(19) \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\downarrow \\
T \\
\downarrow \\
\text{VoiceP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Voice} \\
\downarrow \\
vP \\
\downarrow \\
v_{\text{dat}} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{DP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{vP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{DP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{vP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{DP} \\
\end{array}
\]

My tentative analysis is to say that the structure is the same as in (18), but the numeration is different, and T with \([\bullet \text{case:str} \bullet]\) merges an expletive in its specifier, which receives nominative as a result. Therefore, no case stacking takes place and the DP is assigned dative case only.

The idea of having two syntactic case features on a single DP is supported by data shown by Jónsson (2009a).

\[
(20) \quad \begin{array}{l}
a. \text{Liðunum mangla venjara.} \\
\quad \text{the.teams.DAT need.3PL trainer.ACC} \\
\quad \text{‘The teams need a trainer.’} \\
b. \text{Børnunum tørva eina góða fyrimynd.} \\
\quad \text{the.children.DAT need.3PL a.ACC good.ACC role.model.ACC} \\
\quad \text{‘The children need a good role model.’} \quad (\text{Jónsson 2009a:156})
\end{array}
\]

Here, the finite verb agrees with the dative case DP in number. Jónsson argues that the subject bears covert nominative (he dubs this as the Covert Nominative Hypothesis) — my analysis resembles his in important ways. On Jónsson’s analysis, nominative is assigned in SpecTP by T, whereby the checking relationship between T and the dative is reflected through number agreement. Furthermore, “we can assume that the dative DP is base-generated without a nominative case feature and acquires this feature only after it has moved to Spec,T” (Jónsson 2009a:158).
1.4 Proposal

Regarding the interaction of case and Voice, I propose the following:

1. There are three types of cases, structural, inherent and quirky case.

   (i) Voice is the locus of structural accusative case assignment (cf. Legate 2014) when Voice has a filled specifier which is assigned structural case. When accusative is assigned, Voice usually introduces a thematic role (agent), such as in the progressive passive, but that is not required. This means that Burzio’s generalization is about case.

   (ii) Inherent case is assigned by Appl.

   (iii) Quirky case is assigned by $v_{\text{DAT/GEN}}$ when Voice introduces an external argument (projected or not) or an element in SpecVoiceP is assigned structural case.\(^9\)

2. Case morphology is the result of a three-step process:

   (i) A syntactic relationship with a functional head (e.g., Agree with Voice)

   (ii) A morphological translation of that relationship into a case feature (e.g., ACC)

   (iii) A morphological realization of that feature at Vocabulary Insertion in the morphological component (e.g., -an)

3. Implicit arguments may be projected in the syntax as a bundle of $\phi$-features ($\phi$P), or may fail to project. When they are projected syntactically, they are assigned case, which impacts case calculations, even though they are not DPs. $\phi$Ps are not always implicit, as they can be overtly realized. Syntactically projected implicit arguments, and their explicit counterparts, contribute the same semantically: they restrict argument positions, but do not saturate them.

4. Passive, active, etc., are labels for a collection of properties of VoiceP, where these properties may vary partially independently, yielding constructions that do not fit the traditional labels. I demonstrate how, when and why the dichotomy between actives and passives breaks down.

\(^9\)For a similar idea, where the (right) combination of Voice and $v$ is the locus of case assignment, see H.Á. Sigurðsson 2011, 2012.
1.5 Structure of the dissertation

The structure of the dissertation is as follows.

- Chapter 2 discusses constructions where the boundaries between actives and passives are unclear. For the NIP, the progressive passive and the IMC, I argue that a Weak Implicit Argument projected in SpecVoiceP plays a major role. It is assigned structural case, which leads to the theme being assigned accusative case. The WIA also only restricts the argument position but does not saturate it. This gives rise to passive properties, such as ‘by’-phrases. Moreover, the behavior of WIAs for other modules of the grammar, such as binding and control, are explored. However, I argue that WIAs are not always projected syntactically, such as in CanP and ReflPass.

  Furthermore, I propose that WIAs have an overt counterpart, as I argue that the reflexive pronoun of the ReflPass consists of a bundle of $\phi$-features but lacks a D-feature. I call these Weak Explicit Arguments (WEA).

- Chapter 3 focuses on when non-nominative case is preserved in a grammatical subject position. Again, the focus is on the interaction of Voice and case. I argue that dative and genitive cases are preserved when Voice introduces an external argument or SpecVoiceP is filled. Ability Adjectives (AAs) prima facie pose a problem for this generalization, as Voice introduces an unprojected external argument and yet case is not preserved. We provide an analysis of two types of Icelandic deverbal ability adjectives in the chapter.

  Chapter 3 also discusses three constructions where structural accusative case is preserved on a derived subject. These pose an interesting theoretical puzzle, as structural accusative case is assigned only to phrases if another element (DP/$\phi$P/CL) higher up in the same domain is assigned structural case (nominative). Therefore, we must be able to give an analysis of movement past the nominative DP/$\phi$P/CL, without over-generating. For two of those constructions (the Accusative Tough Construction and Existential Accusatives), I argue for an improper movement account, whereas in the third construction (Fate Accusatives) I argue for a clitic generated in SpecVoiceP which is assigned structural case.

- Chapter 4 examines attributive passives with respect to a peculiar case problem: Passive participles of verbs that take quirky case objects are often ungrammatical in attributive position. I argue that the problem should be reduced to 1) case mismatch and 2) agreement mismatch.

- Chapter 5 concludes.
2 Implicit arguments

2.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses various constructions in which the dichotomy between active and passive breaks down. This has been an important research topic cross-linguistically and changed our ideas about impersonal constructions (see, e.g., Sobin 1985; Maling and Sigurjónsdóttir 2002; Blevins 2003; Harley 2014; Legate 2014). In various constructions discussed here, accusative case is assigned and yet the constructions in question have various passive properties.

To give some examples from Icelandic, the progressive passive, the Impersonal Modal Construction (IMC) and the New Impersonal Passive (NIP) show a mixture of properties. They all preserve structural accusative case (not typical of passives) but still allow agentive ‘by’-phrases (typical for passives). In addition, the NIP (21a) seems to show passive morphology, although the distinction between passive and perfect participle morphology is not clear, whereas the IMC (21b) shows active morphology. The progressive passive is in-between as the main verb does not show passive morphology and it is not clear whether the progressive passive’s ‘be’-participle (verið ‘been’) is a passive or an active participle (21c), as the same form is also used in the perfect.

(21) a. Nýlega var selt mikinn kvóta af útgerðarmanninum Áðalsteini
   ‘Recently, a large quota was sold by the fishing vessel owner.’

b. Það þarf að rannsaka þetta betur af fræðimönnum.
   ‘This needs to be studied further by scholars.’

c. Er verið að afgreiða þig af einherjum?
   ‘Are you being served by anyone?’

The availability of ‘by’-phrases in (21) shows that Voice introduces an external argument, an implicit argument. I argue that how it is syntactically represented has a direct bearing on case assignment (cf. Legate 2014).

Implicit arguments have been studied extensively (e.g., Williams 1985, 1987; Roeper 1987; Bhatt and Pancheva 2006; Landau 2010; van Urk 2013; Legate 2014) and are challenging for any syntactic and semantic theory. Different views have been proposed as to how they are represented. Landau (2010) (see also van Urk 2013) argues that implicit arguments are always syntactically represented. I challenge that, and argue that they are syntactically projected in some cases but not always.

Landau divides implicit arguments into two categories: Weak Implicit Arguments (WIA) and Strong Implicit Arguments (SIA). WIAs contain a set of φ-features but lack D. SIAs contain
both. Landau discusses cases like *The room was left (*angry) in English. For him, the reason why the use of a secondary predicate in this example is ungrammatical is that the projected implicit argument is weak, not strong, and only SIAs (with D) allow secondary predicates.

I demonstrate that implicit arguments are sometimes projected syntactically but in some cases they are not. Icelandic provides a good testing ground for this, as the canonical passive (CanP) and the reflexive passive (Árnadóttir et al. 2011, Schäfer 2012) do not involve a projected implicit argument on my analysis, whereas the IMC (Sigurðsson and Egerland 2009), the progressive passive and the NIP (Maling and Sigurjónsdóttir 2002, Eythórsson 2008, Jónsson 2009b, H.Á. Sigurðsson 2011, E.F.Sigurðsson 2012, Ingason et al. 2013, Legate 2014) all have a syntactically projected implicit argument.

There are at least three syntactic strategies to encode the φ-features of an implicit argument (trees taken from Legate (2014:85–86)):

(22) a. VoiceP
    Voice
    φ
    vP
    v
    VP

b. VoiceP
    φP
    vP
    v
    VP

c. VoiceP
    DP
    φP
    vP
    v
    VP

The tree in (22a) is one way of representing the CanP in Icelandic, which is similar to the passive in English, where structural accusative object case in the active corresponds to structural nominative case in the passive. The implicit argument does not occupy a syntactic position in the tree — if it did, we could expect it to block A-movement of the object and trigger accusative case on the object (see, however, Landau 2010 and van Urk’s 2013 analysis, on which the theme argument moves past a syntactically projected implicit argument). Rather, the implicit argument’s φ-features are encoded on Voice. For the NIP, Legate (2014) proposes the structure in (22b), whereas (22c) is an impersonal active, with an SIA subject, which would be closer to what Maling and Sigurjónsdóttir 2002 propose for the NIP.

I extend Legate’s (2014) analysis of the NIP to both the progressive passive and the IMC, where a WIA (φP) that has a smaller feature set than SIA (pro/PRO) is introduced in SpecVoiceP. This feature set is small enough (φ-features but not D) to not saturate the external argument position, which gives rise to the possibility of using a ‘by’-phrase.

A WIA projected in SpecVoiceP leads to structural accusative assignment to the object. To answer the question when accusative case is assigned, I propose the following generalization:

(23) The structural accusative case generalization

Voice is the locus of structural accusative case assignment (cf. Legate 2014) when Voice has a filled specifier which is assigned structural case.
Importantly, this means that in the NIP, the IMC and the progressive passive, for example, there must be a syntactically projected element that is assigned structural case (nominative). This element is a syntactically projected implicit argument, namely WIA on my analysis. Therefore, I argue that an analysis where, e.g., the NIP is a passive construction without a syntactically projected implicit argument, similar to the canonical passive (Eythórsson 2008; Jónsson 2009b), is not tenable.

I will now take a closer look at WIA s and discuss two constructions, the progressive passive and the reflexive passive. I argue that the progressive passive introduces a WIA in SpecVoiceP that is assigned structural case. The reflexive passive, on the other hand, challenges the structural accusative case generalization (23), as I argue that it does not involve an implicit argument in SpecVoiceP, and yet the reflexive pronoun seems to be assigned accusative case.

2.2 Case study 1a: The progressive passive

2.2.1 Introduction

Various analyses have been suggested for the NIP in Icelandic. It fits well in the cross-linguistic typology of impersonal constructions, being comparable to the Ukrainian no/to construction. Within the Voice system of Icelandic, at a first glance it looks like an innovation — the only construction with a restricting $\phi$P in SpecVoiceP. I argue that this is not the case, as at least the progressive passive and the IMC share the same Voice system. I will now discuss the progressive passive in more detail.

Progressive aspect in Icelandic (24a) is different from the English equivalent (24b) in that vera ‘be’ takes an infinitival clause whereas in English, be selects a present participial clause.

(24) a. Barþjóninn er að afgreiða mig.
the.bartender.NOM is to serve.INF me.ACC
   ‘The bartender is serving me.’

b. The bartender is serving me.

Interestingly, when the progressive is passivized in Icelandic, the main verb, here afgreiða ‘serve’, does not show passive morphology but instead it is the verb vera ‘be’ that seems to be passivized. Also just like in the active, it takes an infinitival clause. This is shown in (25):\(^{10}\)

(25) Það er verið að afgreiða mig.
   EXPL is been.PASS to serve.INF me.ACC
   ‘I’m being served.’

\(^{10}\)The sentence in (25) is a typical answer for a customer who is waiting for her/his drinks at a bar when asked Get ég aðstodad þig? ‘Can I serve you?’ by a bartender.
As we see here, the verb ‘be’ seems to passivize and the accusative case on the object is retained. This is unexpected — we would have expected something like (26):

(26) *Ég er að vera afgreiddur.
     I.NOM am to be.INF served.PASS.M.NOM.SG
     Intended: ‘I am being served.’

This structure is closer to the English passive of the progressive whereas the structure in (25) is different from it. When the progressive in (24b) is passivized (27a), be gets the progressive -ing ending and the main verb, here serve, is passivized. If English were like Icelandic in this respect, the progressive passive would look like the ungrammatical (27b) or (27c).

(27) a. I am being served.
b. *I am been serving.
c. *It/There is been serving me.

The example in (25) shows that structural accusative case is preserved in the Icelandic progressive passive. The progressive passive has other interesting properties: A-movement is blocked (28a), anaphors can be bound (28b), and ‘by’-phrases are grammatical (28c):

(28) a. *Ér ég/mig verið að afgreiða?
     is I.NOM/me.ACC been.PASS to serve.INF
     ‘Am I being served?’
b. Ér verið að afgreiða sjálfan sig?
     is been.PASS to serve.INF self.ACC REFL
     ‘Is someone serving himself?’
c. Ér verið að afgreiða þig af einhverjum?
     is been to serve you by anyone
     ‘Are you being served by anyone?’

This construction raises a number of problems:

(29) a. What is the category of the participle (Voice, Asp ...)?
b. How/Why is the object assigned accusative case? How can an anaphor be bound?
c. Why does the unaccusative vera ‘be’ seem to passivize instead of main verb?
d. How come ‘by’-phrases are grammatical?

The structure I argue for is as shown in (30):
On this analysis, *ver-* is the spellout of Voice and moves to Asp. A WIA (\(\phi P\)) is syntactically projected in SpecVoiceP and this triggers accusative case on the object. This WIA does not saturate the external argument position, which gives rise to the availability of ‘by’-phrases. It should be noted, finally, that a syntactically projected \(\phi\) is capable of binding anaphors, even though it lacks a D-feature.

2.2.2 The NIP and the progressive passive

Maling and Sigurjónsdóttir (2002:134–135) point out the similarity between the progressive passive and other passives formed with aspectual verbs, on the one hand, and the NIP, on the other. They furthermore propose that such constructions may serve as models for the innovation of the NIP. The current analysis builds on their insight, as I argue for the same analysis, to a large extent, of the NIP, the IMC and the progressive passive. It should be mentioned that the progressive passive is also an innovation in Icelandic syntax — it’s younger than the progressive active (Smári 1920, Thráinsson 1974) and the oldest example found in the Icelandic Parsed Historical Corpus (IcePaHC; Wallenberg et al. 2011) is from late 17th century.

There are indeed striking similarities between the progressive passive and the NIP. First of all, structural accusative case is assigned to the object (31b), A-movement is blocked (31a) and binding of anaphors is grammatical (31b).

(31) a. *Var **hana** skilið eftir heima?  
was here.ACC left behind home  
‘Was she left behind at home?’ (Maling and Sigurjónsdóttir 2002:117)
b. [...] það er drepið sjálfan sig.
\[
\text{EXPL is killed self.ACC REFL.ACC}
\]
‘There is taking of one’s life.’

(Árnadóttir et al. 2011:48)

‘By’-phrases are grammatical in the progressive passive, see (21) above, and they seem to be grammatical in the NIP as well (Jónsson 2009b, E.F. Sigurðsson and Stefánsdóttir 2014), although this has been debated in the literature (see especially Maling and Sigurjónsdóttir 2002 for a different view).

Finally, secondary predicates, predicated of the external argument, have been reported to be ungrammatical in the NIP (32a) (Jónsson 2009b:297, H.Á. Sigurðsson 2011:157). They seem to be equally bad in the progressive passive (32b).

(32) a. Var barið hana (*fullur)?
   was beaten her.ACC drunk.M.NOM.SG
   ‘Was she hit (by somebody who was drunk)?’
   (H.Á. Sigurðsson 2011:157)

b. Var verið að berja hana (*fullur)?
   was been to beat her.ACC drunk.M.NOM.SG
   ‘Was she being hit (by somebody who was drunk)?’

Therefore, we pursue the possibility that these constructions share the same syntactic structure.

2.2.2.1 Implicit arguments in the NIP/progressive passive and the CanP

As shown by, e.g., Zaenen and Maling (1984:318), the CanP in Icelandic has an implicit argument (usually an agent or a causer):

(33) Eitraða kakan var borduð af ásettu ráði.
   poisonous the.cake.NOM was eaten deliberately
   ‘The poisonous cake was eaten deliberately.’

To show that there is an implicit argument in the passive example above, we use the PP \textit{af ásettu ráði} ‘deliberately’ to refer to the agent (who did something deliberately, on purpose). This same test works fine with the progressive passive and the NIP:

(34) a. Það er verið að borda
   EXPL is beenPASS to eat.INF
   eitruðu kökuna af ásettu ráði.
   poisonous.ACC cake.the.ACC deliberately
   ‘The poisonous cake is being eaten deliberately.’

b. Það var bordað eitruðu kökuna af ásettu ráði.
   EXPL was eaten poisonous.ACC the.cake.ACC deliberately
   ‘The poisonous cake was eaten deliberately.’

\footnote{This is true of at least some NIP speakers. This remains to be studied in more detail.}
However, the fact that T can establish an Agree relationship with a DP in object position is an indication that there is no syntactically *projected* implicit argument in the CanP.

(35) a. Það voru tald-ir hafa verið veidd-ir fjór lax-ar.
   EXPL were believed-NOM.M.PL have been caught-NOM.M.PL four salmon-NOM.M.PL
   ‘People believed there to have been four salmon caught.’
   (H.Á. Sigurðsson 2006b:293)

   b. Það voru afgreidd-ir tveir viðskiptavinir.
   EXPL were served-NOM.M.PL two-NOM.M.PL customer-NOM.M.PL
   ‘Two customers were served.’

If there were a projected implicit argument in SpecVoiceP, then we would expect it to intervene when T probes to get its φ-features valued. In the progressive passive (and the NIP), T cannot agree with a DP in object position.

(36) a. Það er verið að afgreiða tvo viðskiptavini.
   EXPL is been.PASS to serve.INF two.ACC customers.ACC
   ‘Two customers are being served.’

   b. *Það eru verið að afgreiða tveir viðskiptavinir.
   EXPL are been.PASS to serve.INF two.NOM customers.NOM
   ‘Two customers are being served.’

We’ve now seen that there are obvious parallels to be drawn between the NIP and the progressive passive, whereas the CanP differs in important ways. Before we look at how we can analyse the progressive passive, we have to take a better look at the structure of the progressive active and the progressive passive.

2.2.3 Properties of the progressive

2.2.3.1 The progressive active: ‘be’ is a raising verb
In the progressive in Icelandic, *vera* ‘be’ does not have its own argument structure. Evidence for this comes from case preservation and idioms.

2.2.3.1.1 Case preservation
For a language like Icelandic, where subjects can have other cases than nominative, case preservation is a good test to see whether a verb is a raising verb or not.

*Líka* ‘like’ is a verb that takes a dative subject (37). When it is embedded under a raising verb, like *virðast* ‘seem’, the subject retains its case when it raises (38a). On the other hand, when *líka* is embedded under a control verb like *vonast til* ‘hope to’ (38b), the latter verb takes an argument of its own which it assigns a thematic role. The external argument of the control verb *vonast til* is assigned nominative case but the lower argument, the subject of *líka*, is PRO. This is shown with the examples in (37)–(38).
(37) Haraldi/*Haraldur líkar vel í Stuttgart.
Harold.DAT/NOM likes well in Stuttgart
‘Harold likes it in Stuttgart.’ (Thráinsson and Vikner 1995:60)

(38) a. Haraldi/*Haraldur virðist líka vel í Stuttgart.
Harold.DAT/NOM seems like.INF well in Stuttgart
‘Harold seems to like it in Stuttgart.’

b. Haraldur/*Haraldi vonast til að líka vel í Stuttgart.
Harold.NOM/DAT hopes for to like.INF well in Stuttgart
‘Harold hopes to like it in Stuttgart.’ (Thráinsson and Vikner 1995:60)

We therefore have two different structures in (38): The control verb vonast til ‘hope to’, cf.
(38b), has its own external argument, in the nominative case, and líka ‘like’ takes a PRO
subject. Raising verbs, on the other hand, cf. virðast ‘seem’ in (38a), do not take arguments
of their own and therefore the dative argument of líka A-moves up past virðast ‘seem’ in (38a).

Now we can ask whether vera ‘be’ patterns as a raising verb or a control verb. In the active
question in (39a), the verb líka ‘like’ takes a dative argument which moves to SpecTP. This
is the same for the progressive active question in (39b): the DP henni ‘her’ moves to subject
position and retains its dative case assigned by líka ‘like’. This reflects a raising construction.

(39) a. Hvernig líkar henni/*hún þetta?
how likes her.DAT/NOM this
‘How does he like this?’

b. Hvernig er henni/*hún að líka þetta?
how is her.DAT/NOM to like.INF this
‘How are you liking this?’

This suggests that that progressive vera ‘be’ does not take any arguments of its own and is in
fact a raising verb.

2.2.3.1.2 Idioms
When a subject is a part of an idiom, the idiom cannot be embedded under a control verb, only
under a raising verb (cf. Thráinsson and Vikner 1995). (40) shows an idiomatic expression.

(40) Haltur leiðir blindan.
lame.NOM leads blind.ACC
Literally: ‘Someone with a limp leads a blind person.’
Idiomatic reading: ‘Someone who lacks the relevant skills helps someone who also lacks
relevant skills.’

It’s possible to add a raising verb (41b) to the structure in (40) above, and still get the
idiomatic reading, but not a control verb (41a).
(41) a. #Haltur vonast til að leiða blindan.
   lame.NOM hopes for to lead.INF blind.ACC

b. Haltur virðist leiða blindan.
   lame.NOM seems lead.INF blind.ACC

Just like with raising verbs, using the idiomatic expression in the progressive is fine.

(42) Haltur er hér að leiða blindan.
   lame.NOM is here to lead.INF blind.ACC
   ‘Here, someone with a limp is leading someone who is blind.’

I conclude that progressive ‘be’ is a raising verb.

2.2.3.2 The progressive passive: How much structure?
H.Á. Sigurðsson (1989) argues that in Stylistic Fronting, aspectual verbs, like progressive ‘be’, are of dual nature: sometimes they are raising verbs and sometimes control verbs, taking CP complements. For space reasons, I will not discuss his arguments here. An argument for vera ‘be’ not taking a CP complement, on the other hand, involves unaccusatives. As is well known, in languages like Icelandic that allow passivization of intransitive verbs (impersonal passive), only unergatives, such as dansa ‘dance’, passivize (43b) — unaccusatives, like kafna ‘suffocate’, do not (44b).

(43) a. Margir dönsuðu í veislunni.
   many danced in party.the
   ‘Many people danced at the party.’

b. Það var dansað í veislunni.
   EXPL was danced.PASS in party.the
   ‘People danced at the party.’

(44) a. Margir köfnuðu hér fyrir tveimur mánuðum.
   many suffocated here for two months
   ‘Many people suffocated here two months ago.’

b. *Pað var kafnað hér fyrir tveimur mánuðum.
   EXPL was suffocated.PASS here for two months
   ‘People suffocated here two months ago.’

When a passivized control verb, like reyna ‘try’, takes an intransitive infinitival clause as its complement, it does not matter whether it is an unergative or unaccusative verb. This is shown with an unaccusative verb in (45).

(45) a. Flestir reyndu að kafna (ekki).
   most tried to suffocate.INF not
   ‘Most people tried (not) to suffocate.’
b. Það var reynt að kafna (ekki).
  EXPL was tried to suffocate.INF not
  ‘People tried (not) to suffocate.’

On the other hand, when the progressive passive embeds an intransitive verb, it must be an unergative (46b) — if it is an unaccusative verb, it is ungrammatical (47b).

(46) a. Flestir eru að dansa.
    most are to dance.INF
    ‘Most people are dancing.’

   b. Það er verið að dansa.
      EXPL is been.PASS to dancing.INF
      ‘People are dancing.’

(47) a. Flestir eru að kafna.
    most are to suffocate.INF
    ‘Most people are suffocating.’

   b. *Það er verið að kafna.
      EXPL is been.PASS to suffocate.INF
      ‘People are suffocating.’

This suggests that the progressive passive verið ‘been’ is not a control verb; it does not take a CP complement (as we concluded in §2.2.3.1). It is important to figure out exactly how much structure is involved in the progressive.

In a split verb phrase, with both a Voice and a v projection, v is the locus of event semantics and Voice the locus of the external argument. We use adverbs to show that both projections are involved in the canonical passive (cf. Zaenen and Maling 1984) and the progressive passive (as discussed, the grammaticality of ‘by’-phrases already suggests the exisance of a Voice projection). The use of both event-oriented and external-argument-oriented adverbials is grammatical in the progressive passive:

(48) a. Möguleikarnir voru skoðaðir vandlega.
    options.the.NOM were considered carefully
    ‘The options were considered carefully.’

   b. Nú er verið að skoða möguleikana vandlega.
      now is been.PASS to consider.INF options.the.ACC carefully
      ‘Now the options are being considered carefully.’

(49) a. Nýjar peysur voru prjónaðar af kappi.
    new.NOM sweaters.NOM were knitted with zeal
    ‘New sweaters were knitted enthusiastically.’

   b. Nú er verið að prjóna nýjar peysur af kappi.
      now is been.PASS to knit.INF new.ACC sweaters.ACC with zeal
      ‘Now, new sweaters are being knitted enthusiastically.’

The manner adverb vandlega ‘carefully’ describes in which manner the event was carried out whereas the agent modifier af kappi ‘enthusiastically’ describes how the agent carried out his or her task. The data above suggest that in the progressive passive, as well as in the canonical passive, we have both VoiceP and vP.
However, the construction does not seem to contain an embedded TP. A relevant test for that is negation.

(50)  

a. Hún hafði {ekki} verið {ekki} að {ekki} borða {ekki} kókuna {ekki}.  
she had not been.PRIF not to not eat.INF not the.cake not  
‘The woman had not been eating the cake.’  

b. Það var {ekki} verið {ekki} að {ekki} borða {ekki} kókuna {ekki}.  
EXPL was not been.PASS not to not eat.INF not the.cake not  
‘The cake was not being eaten.’

Both in the progressive active and the progressive passive the only place for negation is between the finite verb and verið. This suggests that the progressive does not take an embedded TP. Compare this to the control verb structure below:

(51)  

a. Ég lofaði að {ekki} lesa {ekki} bókina {ekki}.  
I promised to not read.INF not book.the not  
‘I promised not to read the book.’  

b. Það var lofað að {ekki} lesa {ekki} bókina {ekki}.  
it was promised to not read.INF not book.the not  
‘It was tried not to read the book.’

In the embedded infinitival clause, the verb moves above negation to at least T (e.g., Platzack 1986, Sigurðsson 1989, Rögnvaldsson and Thráinsson 1990, Thráinsson 2007:§8). Therefore we see that the control verb embeds a TP (and, actually, a CP) whereas the progressive does not.

Using the facts discussed above, we now turn to the analysis of the progressive passive.

2.2.4 Analysis

2.2.4.1 Weak Implicit Argument in SpecVoiceP in the NIP

Following Landau’s (2010) division of implicit arguments into strong and weak categories and based on the properties of the NIP, outlined above, Legate (2014) (see also Ingason et al. 2013) argues that there is a WIA that restricts, but does not saturate, the subject position.

WIAs differ from SIAs (pro/PRO) in lacking a D-head, that is, WIAs are not DPs. Landau (2010) argues that a secondary predicate must be predicated of a DP. By arguing that the implicit argument of the NIP is not a DP, but also that it occupies a syntactic position, Legate (2014) accounts for the ungrammaticality of secondary predicates in the NIP. Also, Voice assigns the object accusative case and the WIA blocks T from establishing an Agree relationship with the DP object. Crucially, because the WIA does not saturate the external argument position (SpecVoiceP), ‘by’-phrases are possible.

Legate follows Kratzer (1996) in assuming that external arguments (a WIA in the case of the NIP) are introduced by Voice, through an operation called Event Identification.
(52) **Event Identification** *(adapted from Kratzer 1996:122)*

If $\alpha$ is a branching node, $\{\beta, \gamma\}$ is the set of $\alpha$’s daughters, and $\beta$ is of type $\langle e, st \rangle$ and $\gamma$ is of type $\langle s, t \rangle$, then $\alpha$ is of type $\langle e, st \rangle$.

Here, $\alpha$ could be Voice', $\beta$ Voice and $\gamma$ be $vP$. This is shown in the following for *read the book* *(adapted from Kratzer 1996).*

(53) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{Voice'} \\
\text{Event Identification} \\
\lambda x. \lambda e. \text{AGENT}(e,x) & \& \text{reading}(e) \\
& \& \text{THEME}(e, \text{the book}) \\
\text{Voice} & \quad vP \\
\lambda x. \lambda e. \text{AGENT}(e,x) & \quad \lambda e. \text{reading}(e) & \& \text{THEME}(e, \text{the book})
\end{align*}
\]

If Voice introduces an agent role, it will have to be saturated somehow. Legate argues that $\phi P$ *(WIA)* sitting in SpecVoiceP restricts the external argument position but does not saturate the agent role introduced by Voice. She proposes that Voice (of type $\langle e, st \rangle$) combines with $\phi$ (of type $\langle e, t \rangle$), through Restrict.

(54) **Restrict** *(adapted from Legate 2014:39)*

If $\alpha$ is a branching node, $\{\beta, \gamma\}$ is the set of $\alpha$’s daughters, and $\beta$ is of type $\langle e, st \rangle$ and $\gamma$ is of type $\langle e, t \rangle$, then $\alpha$ is of type $\langle e, st \rangle$.

Here, $\alpha$ could be VoiceP, $\beta$ Voice' and $\gamma$ be $\phi P$. This is shown in (56), where a derivation for the NIP sentence (55) $\text{Pað var leðið bókina}$ ‘The book was read’ is given *(the derivation below follows Legate 2014).*

(55)
\[
\text{Pað var leðið bókina.} \\
\text{EXPL was read.PASS book.the.ACC} \\
\text{‘The book was read.’}
\]
In the derivation, we cannot use FA to saturate the agent role. Instead we use Chung and Ladusaw’s (2004) predicate restriction. That of course does not saturate the external argument position either. Saturation is accomplished through existential closure applying to VoiceP (Legate 2014):

(57) \[[\text{VoiceP}] = \lambda e. \exists x [\text{AGENT}(e,x) \& \phi(x) \& \text{reading}(e) \& \text{THEME}(e,\text{the book})]\]

With a ‘by’-phrase, the derivation is as follows:
In Legate’s derivation, the PP takes the VoiceP as an argument. ‘By’-phrases are optional, when they are used, they further restrict the argument position (similarly, they also do not saturate the agent position). As before, saturation is accomplished through existential closure:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{VoiceP} &: \lambda x. \lambda e. \text{AGENT}(e,x) & \phi(x) & \text{reading}(e) \\
& & \& \text{THEME}(e, \text{the book}) & \& \text{AGENT}(e, \text{John}) & x = \text{John}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{byP} &: \lambda y. \lambda f \langle e, \text{st} \rangle \lambda x. \lambda e. f(e,x) \\
& & \& \text{AGENT}(e, \text{John}) & x = \text{John}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{DP} &: \lambda y. \lambda f \langle e, \text{st} \rangle \lambda x. \lambda e. f(e,x) \\
& & \& \text{AGENT}(e,y) & x = y
\end{align*}
\]

The reading this gives us is that there is some x such that x read the book and x is John.

The progressive passive shares a lot of features with the NIP. I argue in the next section that we can extend the analysis above to the progressive passive.

### 2.2.4.2 The progressive passive: ver- in Voice, \( \phi \)P in SpecVoiceP

We have already seen that the progressive passive is the same as the NIP in various ways: accusative case is assigned, binding of anaphors is grammatical, ‘by’-phrases are allowed, but secondary predicates are not. This, I argue, suggests that we can analyse the progressive passive in the same way as the NIP, namely, with a \( \phi \)P in SpecVoiceP.

But what position should posit for verið ‘been’? The term ‘progressive’ suggests that we are dealing with aspect (Asp). However, auxiliary vera ‘be’ does not behave like hafa ‘have’, for example, which together with a past participle makes a perfect reading. We show this with the unergative verb dansa ‘dance’ below. First, (60b) and (60a) show the active of dansa ‘dance’, with and without the auxiliary ‘have’.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(60) a. Við dönsuðum.} & \quad \text{(Active)} \\
& \quad \text{we danced} \\
& \quad \text{‘We danced.’}
\end{align*}
\]
b. Við hófum oft dansað.
   we have often danced
   ‘We have often danced.’

Even in a perfect construction in the passive with the auxiliary ‘have’, the main verb (that “loses” one argument) is passivized (61b) and not the auxiliary (61c) (pay attention to the labels PASS and PRF in the examples below).

(61) a. Það var dansað.
   EXPL was danced
   ‘There was dancing.’

b. Það hefur oft verið dansað.
   EXPL has often been danced
   ‘There has often been dancing.’

c. *Það var oft haft dansað.
   EXPL was often had
   ‘There has often been dancing.’

This is different from the progressive passive because in that case, ‘be’ seems to be passivized. Therefore, it is possible that ‘have’ is base-generated higher in the tree, above aspect (e.g., as the head of AuxP).

It is also important to point out that examples like the following are ungrammatical:

(62) *Pað hafði verið að dansa.
   EXPL had been to dance
   *Pað hafði verið verið að dansa.
   EXPL had been been to dance

(62a) shows that we need two instances of ‘be’ in the progressive passive. However, as (62b) shows, it is not possible to have two participles verið ‘been’ — the first one is a past participle and the second a passive participle. It is not the case, though, that two consecutive instances of non-finite ‘be’ are always impossible, as shown in (63):

(63a). a. Pað mun vera verið að borda.
   EXPL will be.been to eat
   ‘Apparently, somebody is eating.’

   (Anton Karl Ingason, p.c.)

   b. Pað virðist vera verið að pirra mig.
   EXPL seems be.been to irritate me
   ‘It seems that somebody is irritating me.’

Therefore, the ungrammaticality of *verið verið in (62) indicates that both participles “want” to be in Asp: verið selected by ‘have’ is in Asp and so is verið selected by ‘be’.

We are now able to draw a tree structure with the projections we need according to the description of the progressive given above.
Placing ‘been’ in Asp does not, however, account for why it seems to be passivized in the progressive passive. I therefore argue that the passive participle verið starts out lower than Asp — in Voice. 

But what about the following sentence where the subject, presumably in SpecVoiceP, is lower than the participle?

(65) Það virðast ekki hafa verið margir að pirra þig.
EXPL seem not have.INF been.PRF many.NOM to irritate.INF you
‘There do not seem to be many that were irritating you.’

If the subject is base-generated lower than ‘be’, then ‘be’ does not start out in Voice. We saw in (62) that passive verið competes with active verið for the Asp position. I argue that in the progressive passive, ‘be’ moves from Voice to Asp. That way we are able to account for the fact that ‘be’ seems to passivize in the progressive passive. The relevant structure is shown in (66) (where the WIA is shown as φP).
On this account, the implicit argument introduced in SpecVoiceP is not from \textit{ver(ið)} ‘be(en)’ but from the main verb \textit{afgreiða} ‘serve’. Because ‘be’ is in Voice, however, it shows passive morphology while ‘serve’ does not.

2.2.5 Interim summary

On the surface, it looks like \textit{vera} ‘be’ is being passivized in the progressive passive. As I have demonstrated, however, \textit{vera} is a raising verb. Therefore, I argue that the progressive passive involves the passivization of the main verb, even though nothing in the morphology suggests that; ‘be’ is the realization of Voice and moves to Asp, showing “passive” morphology.

In this dissertation, I extend Legate’s (2014) analysis of the NIP to the progressive passive and other constructions. A crucial part of the analysis is positing a restricting WIA in SpecVoiceP. I propose, however, that weak arguments (\(\phi\)Ps) are not always implicit, as they are sometimes realized overtly. I discuss that in the next subsection.

2.3 Case study 1b: The reflexive passive and Weak Explicit Arguments

2.3.1 Introduction

As Strong Implicit Arguments have overt counterparts (pronouns), we can ask whether Weak Implicit Arguments are ever overtly realized. I argue that the simplex reflexive pronoun in Icelandic is a Weak Explicit Argument (WEA), consisting of a \(\phi\)-bundle but lacking D.\(^{12}\)

\(^{12}\)This case study is based in part on a joint work with Thórhallur Eythórsson and Anton Karl Ingason, see Eythórsson et al. (2015).
This relates to the reflexive passive (ReflPass), which is superficially similar to the NIP in that the accusative form of the reflexive pronoun is grammatical in the construction and yet there is no overt antecedent. In this section I discuss the current state of my analysis of both reflexive pronouns as WEAs and the ReflPass, which on my account does not have a projected implicit argument (antecedent).

Reflexive passives, found in German (Schäfer 2012) and Icelandic, are a potential counterexample to the structural accusative case generalization ((23) is repeated as (67)).

(67) The structural accusative case generalization

Voice is the locus of structural accusative case assignment (cf. Legate 2014) when Voice has a filled specifier which is assigned structural case.

Even though the NIP is ungrammatical for many speakers, most speakers either find reflexive passives of monotransitives grammatical, or at least much better than the NIP, as first pointed out by H.Á. Sigurðsson (1989). This means, as Schäfer (2012) points out, that we need a different analysis for the ReflPass (68) than for the NIP.

(68) Svo var drifð sig á ball.
    then was hurried.DFLT REFL on dance
‘Then there was hurrying off to a dance.’

I argue that there is no syntactically projected implicit argument in the ReflPass, of inherently and naturally reflexive verbs. The simplex reflexive pronoun sig has the form of accusative case. It is, however, the highest argument in its domain. Importantly, there is a gap in the reflexive pronoun paradigm, such that there is no nominative form. I argue that the realization of unmarked case (nominative) is sig (when sig has a syntactic antecedent, such as in the active, sig is realized with dependent case, accusative).

In addition, I argue that sig is an explicit realization of a WIA, lacking a D-feature. That is, it is a Weak Explicit Argument (WEA). As there is no implicit argument syntactically projected in the ReflPass, unlike the NIP and the progressive passive, the construction requires semantic binding on my account.

I lay out the details of my analysis below. I will start, however, with a discussion on reflexive pronouns in Icelandic.
2.3.2 Reflexive pronouns

2.3.2.1 The simplex vs. complex reflexive pronoun in Icelandic

The 3rd person simplex reflexive pronoun is the same for both numbers (singular and plural) and all genders (masculine, feminine and neuter). It is found in three out of four cases, accusative, dative and genitive, as seen in Table 1. As mentioned, there is no nominative form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>sér</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>sín</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The third person simplex reflexive pronoun.

Therefore, the anaphor in (69)–(71) is the same whether the antecedent is 3rd person singular *hún* ‘she’, *María* or 3rd person plural *þeir*, *þær* ‘they’.

(69) a. Hún montaði sig af þessu.  
*b. Þær* montuðu sig af þessu.  
She boasted REFL.ACC of this  
‘She boasted of/about this.’

(70) a. María hegðaði sér vel.  
*María* behaved REFL.DAT well  
‘María behaved well.’

(71) a. María skammaðist sín.  
*María* shamed REFL.GEN  
‘María was ashamed.’

However, we find the equivalent of the 3rd person *sig* for other persons, where there is a distinction made between singular and plural. This is shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>1.SG</th>
<th>1.PL</th>
<th>2.SG</th>
<th>2.PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>mig</td>
<td>okkur</td>
<td>þig</td>
<td>ykkur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>mér</td>
<td>okkur</td>
<td>þér</td>
<td>ykkur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>mín</td>
<td>okkar</td>
<td>þín</td>
<td>ykkar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The simplex reflexive pronoun for first and second person.

The anaphor is therefore different for a first person singular antecedent *ég* ‘I’, see (72a), than for a first person plural antecedent *við* ‘we’, see (72b).

(72) a. Ég montaði mig af þessu.  
*I.NOM* boasted 1.SG.REFL.ACC of this  
‘I boasted of/about this.’
b. Við montuðum okkur af þessu.

‘We boasted of/about this.’

The complex reflexive pronoun, on the other hand, consists of the simplex reflexive pronoun as well as sjálfur ‘self’. The word sjálfur is found itself in the nominative but there is no complex reflexive form in the nominative. There is a difference made in number and gender for ‘self’ (but not in person). This is shown in combination with third person sig in Table 3. This data is shown here as it is important for the three-way distinction of reflexive verbs discussed in the next subsection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M.SG+3</th>
<th>F.SG+3</th>
<th>N.SG+3</th>
<th>M.PL+3</th>
<th>F.PL+3</th>
<th>N.PL+3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>sjálfan sig</td>
<td>sjálfa sig</td>
<td>sjálft sig</td>
<td>sjálfa sig</td>
<td>sjálfar sig</td>
<td>sjálf sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>sjálfrum sér</td>
<td>sjálfrí sér</td>
<td>sjálfru sér</td>
<td>sjálfrum sér</td>
<td>sjálfrum sér</td>
<td>sjálfrum sér</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>sjálfs sín</td>
<td>sjálfrar sín</td>
<td>sjálfs sín</td>
<td>sjálfr sín</td>
<td>sjálfr sín</td>
<td>sjálfr sín</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The complex reflexive pronoun for third person.

### 2.3.2.2 Three classes of reflexive verbs

As is well known, reflexive verbs are often divided into three classes: inherently reflexive verbs, naturally reflexive verbs and naturally disjoint verbs. The verbs in the ReflPass are either inherently or naturally reflexive, but not naturally disjoint. As noted above, Icelandic has both a simplex and a complex reflexive pronoun. The simplex reflexive pronoun sig is used with inherently and naturally reflexive verbs whereas the complex reflexive pronoun is used with naturally disjoint verbs.

The object of inherently reflexive verbs is obligatorily co-indexed with the subject; these verbs cannot take a non-reflexive (referential) DP object. Only the simplex reflexive pronoun is allowed; the complex reflexive pronoun cannot be used with these verbs. This is shown below.\(^\text{13}\)

(73) Jón montaði sig / *sjálfan sig / *Maríu af þessu.

‘Jón boasted of/about this.’

Naturally reflexive verbs can take either the simplex reflexive pronoun or a non-reflexive DP. The complex reflexive pronoun can be used if it has a focus (such as contrastive focus). In “out-of-the-blue contexts, the simple reflexive is strongly preferred” (Schäfer 2012:217).

\(^\text{13}\)The same facts as are shown in (73–75) hold for Dutch (Schäfer 2012).
Finally, naturally disjoint verbs are most naturally used with non-reflexive DP objects. When a reflexive object is used, it is usually the complex reflexive pronoun.

(75) Hún hatar ??sig / sjálfa sig / Pétur.
    she hates ??refl. acc / self. acc refl. acc / Pétur. acc
    ‘She hates herself/Pétur.’

2.3.3 The internal structure of the simplex reflexive pronoun

2.3.3.1 A difference between reflexive passives and the NIP

It has been noted in the literature that even though the NIP is ungrammatical for many speakers, most speakers either find the ReflPass grammatical, or at least much better than the NIP (Sigurðsson 1989; Maling and Sigurjónsdóttir 2002; Árnadóttir et al. 2011).14. It is therefore important to analyse the ReflPass and the NIP differently, as some speakers’ grammars can generate the ReflPass even though they cannot generate the NIP. On the other hand, I assume that all NIP speakers can generate reflexive passives.

There is a crucial difference between the ReflPass example in (68), repeated as (76a), which contains the simplex reflexive pronoun, and (31b), repeated as (76b), which involves the complex reflexive pronoun.

(76) a. Svo var drifið sig á ball.
    then was hurried. dflt refl on dance
    ‘Then there was hurrying off to a dance.’

b. [...] það er drepið sjálfa sig.
    EXPL is killed self. acc refl. acc
    ‘There is taking of one’s life.’ (Árnadóttir et al. 2011:48)

Many speakers find examples like (76b) ungrammatical, even though they find reflexive passives grammatical. The reasons for this, I propose, are twofold: 1) sjálfa sig is a DP, whereas sig is a φP, lacking D; 2) the structure of the ReflPass and the NIP is different in that there is no projected antecedent in the ReflPass, but there is a syntactically projected WIA in the NIP. I argue that (76b) is an instance of the NIP, generated by a different grammar than generates the ReflPass.

14This is the case in German as well: The NIP is ungrammatical whereas reflexive passives are grammatical (Schäfer 2012).
2.3.3.2 A \( \phi \)P but not a DP

The status of the simplex reflexive pronoun (which I will call \( \text{sig} \) below) is not entirely clear: Jónsson (2011) argues it is an argument whereas Árnadóttir et al. (2011) claim it is a syntactic but not a semantic argument. I agree that it is an argument, but in the interest of space, I will not discuss arguments in favor of that here. I will, however, discuss the syntax and semantics of the ReflPass. I propose that \( \text{sig} \), when it is the object of inherently and naturally reflexive verbs, is a Weak Explicit argument (WEA), consisting of \( \phi \)-features but lacking a D-feature. The arguments in favor of this proposal are presented below.

First, \( \text{sig} \) is like -\( st \) in that it cannot be coordinated with a DP.

\[(77) \begin{align*}
a. \text{??Jón rakāði sig og mig / brōður sinn / Guðmund.} \\
\text{Jón shaved REFL and me.ACC / brother.ACC own.REFL.ACC / G.ACC}
b. \text{??Jón baðaði sig og mig / brōður sinn / Guðmund.} \\
\text{Jón bathed REFL and me.ACC / brother.ACC own.REFL.ACC / G.ACC}
\end{align*} \]

(Árnadóttir et al. 2011:77)

A possible reason is that \( \text{sig} \) is \( \phi \)P and cannot coordinate with a DP.

Second, \( \text{sig} \) is ungrammatical with a secondary predicate, unlike sjálfan \( \text{sig} \).\(^{15}\)

\[(78) \begin{align*}
a. \text{Jón dreif sig \{fullan\} í búðina \{fullan\}} \\
\text{Jón.NOM drove REFL.ACC drunk.ACC to.the.store drunk.ACC}
\text{‘Jón hurried to the store.’}
b. \text{Jón dreif Mariú/hana \{fulla\} í búðina \{fulla\}} \\
\text{Jón drove María/her.ACC drunk.ACC to.the.store drunk.ACC}
\text{‘Jón drove María/her, who was drunk, (with him) to the store.’}
c. \text{Jón dreif sjálfan sig \{?fullan\} í búðina \{?fullan\}} \\
\text{Jón drove self.ACC REFL.ACC drunk.ACC to.the.store drunk.ACC}
\text{‘Jón drove himself drunk to the store.’}
\end{align*} \]

In both of the sentences above, we see the verb drīfa, which has the meaning of ‘drive’, in the sense of making somebody do something (not in the sense of driving a car). Drīfa is a naturally reflexive verb: It can either take a simplex reflexive pronoun (78a) or a DP (78b–c). The former has a somewhat idiomatic reading, as it means ‘to hurry’. What is interesting about these examples is that an adjective like fullur ‘drunk’ can only be predicated of the direct object if it is a DP (Mariú/hana/sjálfan \( \text{sig} \)) but not if it is a simplex reflexive pronoun. The contrast is explained if \( \text{sig} \) is a \( \phi \)P, lacking D which is necessary for secondary predication.

Third, there is no Definiteness Effect (DE) in the ReflPass, the progressive passive and the NIP, but for different reasons, as I propose. In the progressive passive and the NIP, a \( \phi \)P is located in SpecVoiceP. Having \( \phi \)P in SpecVoiceP does not lead to DE as the \( \phi \)-bundle is

\(^{15}\)Examples like (78c) are usually not perfect but definitely not ungrammatical.
not definite (lacks D). The object must stay in situ since φP blocks movement to a derived subject position — the object can be definite without causing DE. For the ReflPass, I propose that there is no projected WIA in SpecVoiceP. I assume that the D-feature on pronouns is responsible for their definiteness and if sig in ReflPass lacks D, then there is no DE in ReflPass (i.e., DE applies to elements with a D-feature).

Fourth, when an antecedent is present, as in the active counterpart of the ReflPass, its φ features are expressed overtly on the WEA.

(79) Við drifum okkur á ball.
    we hurried REFL.ACC.1PL on dance
    ‘We hurried off to a dance.’

Something other than φ-features is missing from REFL, namely D.

I propose that the simplex reflexive pronoun lacks a D-feature, that it is a bundle of unvalued φ-features that need to get valued in the derivation. It is an overt equivalent of a Weak Implicit Arguments, I therefore call it a Weak Explicit Argument (WEA). As mentioned above, on Legate’s (2014) analysis, secondary predicates are not possible in the NIP because they cannot be predicated of a WIA, which lacks a D-feature. The complex reflexive pronoun has a richer structure, on the other hand, and has a D-head.

If there is no syntactic antecedent in the ReflPass, as I propose, then we have to say something about Binding Principle A. I take this to suggest that Binding Principle A applies to DP anaphors like sjálfan sig but not anaphors like sig, which are φPs.

On the present approach, reflexivity of sig only requires semantic binding. I follow Legate (2014), who proposes that a WIA (φP) of the type ⟨e,t⟩ can restrict an argument position but cannot saturate it (cf. Chung and Ladusaw 2004). In the same way, the WEA restricts the object position. The WEA, of the type ⟨e,t⟩, combines with a property of type ⟨e,st⟩ via the Restrict operation. This is shown below for the ReflPass sentence in (80):

(80) Það var rakað sig.
    EXPL was shaved REFL
    ‘Someone shaved.’
I assume that a $\phi P$ object of *raka*, of the type $\langle e,t \rangle$, combines with the verb via Restrict, ensuring identity of theme and agent. Existential closure then gives:

\[
(82) \quad [\text{VoiceP}] = \lambda e. \exists x [\text{AGENT}(e,x) & \text{shaving}(e) & \text{THEME}(e,x) & \phi(x)]
\]

That is, the agent and the theme are bound by the same existential quantifier.

### 2.3.4 Case

If the ReflPass does not have any syntactically projected antecedent, then that creates a problem for our understanding of case: How can a phrase bear accusative case if there is no phrase higher in the same domain that bears structural case? I argue that accusative reflexive morphology has been extended to the nominative for Weak Explicit Arguments. When the simplex reflexive pronoun has a syntactic antecedent, such as in the active, it is assigned structural case. In the morphological component, this is translated into dependent case (accusative). The realization of the simplex reflexive pronoun in the dependent case, at Vocabulary Insertion, is $\text{sig}$. In the ReflPass as well, the simplex reflexive pronoun is assigned structural case. It is translated into unmarked case (nominative) but realized also as $\text{sig}$. I explore this possibility in greater detail in the dissertation.\(^{16}\)

\(^{16}\)See Schäfer 2012 for a different analysis.
2.3.5 Interim summary

Even though superficially they are very similar, the fact that most speakers find the ReflPass grammatical whereas only a subset of these speakers find the NIP grammatical makes us posit two different analyses, one for the NIP and one for the ReflPass. In the dissertation, I look in more detail into the ReflPass, which posits many interesting theoretical problems, such as how structural accusative case, at least on the surface, seems to be assigned without any antecedent in the same dependency receiving nominative.

The dissertation also explores the possibility of overt realizations of weak arguments ($\phi$Ps). That gives Landau's (2010) theory of WIA more theoretical appeal, as, on my analysis, weak arguments are not only implicit.

The hypothesis of Weak Explicit Arguments relates also to to the weak/strong distinction in Cardinaletti and Starke’s (1996; 1999) work and also Déchaine and Wiltschko’s (2002) three-way distinction of pronouns: DPs, NPs, $\phi$Ps. As mentioned above, reflexive passives are also found in German. Interestingly, on the basis of examples as in (77), Cardinaletti and Starke (1996:59–60) propose that inherent reflexive sich in German is a deficient pronoun. I will consider a comparison of Icelandic and German in this regard, to explore whether my account can be extended to German.

2.4 Summary and further research

This chapter investigates different Voice constructions, which show a mixture of active and passive properties. In these constructions, ‘by’-phrases are grammatical, which is considered typical for passive constructions. However, structural accusative case is assigned, which is unusual for the passive, but found, nevertheless, in various “passive” constructions cross-linguistically.

On the morphological side, it is interesting how different these constructions are. The NIP and the ReflPass share passive morphology with the canonical passive (auxiliary verá ‘be’ + participle). The IMC, on the other hand, only exhibits active morphology. The progressive passive is in-between, with auxiliary verá + the verið ‘been’ participle. The main verb, whose valency is reduced, shows no signs of passive morphology, however.

What being a “passive” comes down to, then, is possibly only demotion and existential binding of the external argument, as suggested most recently by Bruening and Tran (2015).

Having said that, it should be noted that the IMC is usually described and analysed as having a pro or PRO (SIA) subject that saturates the external argument (e.g., H.Á. Sigurðsson and Egerland 2009). Importantly for the IMC, when secondary predicates, predicated of the implicit argument, are grammatical, ‘by’-phrases are not, and vice versa. I look into this in the dissertation.

Other constructions that I will account for, which may be analysed in a similar way as
the NIP, IMC and the progressive passive, are the Accusative Tough Construction (AccTC), see (83), and Ability Participles (APs), see (84).

(83) Haturræðu er hægt að tjá munnlega eða í skriflegu formi af hverjum sem er hate.speech.ACC is possible to express orally or in written form by whoever ‘It’s possible to express hate orally or in writing by anyone.’ (E.F. Sigurðsson 2012:5)

(84) það er ekki drekk-andi Miller nema ÍSKALDANN EXPL is not drink-ing Miller unless ice.cold.ACC ‘There is no drinking Miller unless it is ice-cold.’ (Wood and Sigurðsson 2014a)

The same goes for the AccTC as the IMC, in that sometimes the external argument position of the infinitival clause is saturated by an SIA, whereas in other cases a WIA seems to restrict that position. APs are usually quite similar to the CanP with respect to structural case, as will become evident in Chapter 3. In (84), however, the object is assigned structural accusative case (as the accusative adjective ‘ice.cold’ shows), similar to the NIP, IMC and the progressive passive. This needs further inspection.

The nature of weak arguments is at the heart of this chapter. I propose that syntactically, WEAs are the same as projected WIAs in that they consist of a $\phi$-bundle and bear case, but lack D. It is therefore a welcome result that their semantic contribution is the same in the NIP (WIA) and the ReflPass (WEA). They restrict, but do not saturate, an argument position.

However, challenging problems remain. Reflexive passives of ditransitives (85) pose a problem for the structural accusative case generalization as there is no overt nominative external argument (antecedent of the reflexive).

(85) Það var fengið sér öllara. EXPL was gotten.DFLT REFL.DAT beer.ACC ‘People got themselves a beer.’ (Eythórsson 2008:187)

The indirect object is a simplex reflexive pronoun and the direct object is a DP in the accusative case. Many speakers who find the NIP ungrammatical find this structure grammatical (Árnadóttir et al. 2011). The dissertation will extend the discussion to reflexive passives of ditransitives, which also prima facie challenge the accusative generalization.

Another theoretically interesting problem that has to do with ditransitive passives is where an indirect object moves to a grammatical subject position and an accusative direct object stays in situ. Jónsson (2009b) argues that such examples show that the NIP cannot have an implicit external argument.

(86) Var þeim ekki einu sinni sýnt íbúðina fyrst? was them.DAT not even shown.DFLT the.apartment.ACC first ‘Weren’t they even shown the apartment first?’ (Jónsson 2009b)
This problem has a clear resemblance to Faroese dat-acc structures in the passive and the active where a dative argument moves to subject position and the direct object is in the accusative case. It should be emphasized, however, that the equivalent of the NIP or the ReftPass is not found in Faroese.

3 Argument structure and subject case

3.1 Introduction

In Icelandic, the derived position is not reserved for nominative DPs only: DPs in quirky/inherent accusative, dative and genitive case can move to a derived subject position (SpecTP) and even structural accusative subjects are also possible. This chapter discusses the interaction of non-nominative subject case preservation and its interaction with Voice. It discusses when case in a derived subject position is derived and when it is not. It furthermore explores what restrictions there are on the subject position in Icelandic, discussing constructions with structural accusative subjects.

Regarding non-structural case, my working hypothesis is that if Voice introduces an external argument or if an element that is assigned structural case occupies SpecVoiceP, case is preserved. I call this the quirky case generalization:

(87) The quirky case generalization

Quirky case is assigned by \( v_{\text{DAT/GEN}} \) when Voice introduces an external argument (projected or not) or an element in SpecVoiceP is assigned structural case.

There are various constructions that preserve non-structural subject case, such as the active and the eventive passive. There are also various constructions that do not preserve non-structural case — this is usually true of middles and anticausatives.

(88) a. Ég týndi úrinnu. I.NOM lost the.watch.DAT ‘I lost the watch.’

b. Úrinnu var týnt. the.watch.DAT was lost

c. Úrið týndi-st. the.watch.NOM lost-ST ‘The watch got lost.’ (Svenonius 2006)

It should be added that ‘by’-phrases are grammatical in the eventive passive, but not in middles or anticausatives, suggesting that only eventive passives have an implicit argument.
For Svenonius (2006), there is a direct relationship between how rich the syntactic structure is and the ability to assign dative and genitive case: middles and anticausatives (88c), on that account, are not capable of preserving case as at least a Voice projection is lacking.

Another construction which has been argued to lack Voice and verbal structure is the stative passive (e.g., Embick 2004a). In Icelandic, as in middles and anticausatives, case is not preserved in the stative passive and ‘by’-phrases are not grammatical.17

(89) Úrið er týnt (*af einhverjum).  
the.watch.NOM is lost (*by someone)  
‘The watch is lost.

As pointed out above, dative and genitive are usually not preserved in anticausatives. There are some causative-inchoative alternations where non-structural case is preserved:

(90) a. Þeir hvolfdu bátnum.  
they capsized the.boat.DAT  
‘They capsized the boat.’

b. Bátnum hvolfdi (*viljandi).  
the.boat.DAT capsized (*on.purpose)  
‘The boat capsized.’

(Zaenen and Maling 1984:318)

This poses a problem for the quirky case generalization, as there does not seem to be an external argument (agent) in this construction. However, I currently extend Wood’s (2015c) analysis of so-called Fate Accusatives to cases like these. The proposal is that a silent clitic, which is assigned structural case, is projected in SpecVoiceP. This is stipulative as it stands but the dissertation will explore this possibility in detail.

Given the discussion above, there is a correlation between case preservation and the availability of ‘by’-phrases: If quirky case is not preserved, ‘by’-phrases are not allowed. Icelandic deverbal ability adjectives, however, add further complications to the problem of the preservation of non-structural case. There are two types of ability adjectives in Icelandic, one allows ‘by’-phrases but does not preserve quirky dative and genitive case (Ability Adjectives, AAs), see (91b); the other does not allow ‘by’-phrases whereas case is indeed preserved (Ability Participles, APs), see (91c).

(91) a. Við breytum ekki lögnum.  
we change not the.laws  
‘We don’t change the laws.’

Note that it is important to tease apart resultative and stative passives. Whereas stative passives describe a state, resultative passives describe a state resulting from a previous event. In the resultative passive, unlike the stative passive, case is preserved, pointing to verbal structure. Resultative passives seem to allow ‘by’-phrases in some cases, as argued by McIntyre (2013) and Bruening (2014). Even though it’s possible that stative passives do not have a verbal structure (including Voice), resultative passives have a verbal layer and can have Voice (McIntyre 2013; Bruening 2014; Alexiadou et al. 2014b).
b. Lögin eru ekki breyt-an-leg (af neinum).
   the.laws.NOM are not change-ing-ADJ (by anyone)
   ‘The laws are not changeable (by anyone).’

(c) Lögunum er ekki breyt-andi (*af neinum)
   the.laws.DAT is not change-ing (*by anyone)
   ‘The laws are not changeable.’

(adapted from Wood and Sigurðsson 2014a:354, 355)

Clearly, AAs and APs complicate the picture, whether we follow the quirky case generalization or Svenonius (2006): AAs introduce an external argument, as witnessed by the availability of ‘by’-phrases, and clearly have a rich structure but nevertheless they do not license dative and genitive cases. That is, AAs are like middles, anticausatives and stative passives with respect to case preservation, but like eventive passives with respect to ‘by’-phrases (external argument). APs have the opposite properties, making them like eventive passives with respect to case preservation but like middles, anticausatives and stative passives with respect to ‘by’-phrases. I will now discuss these ability adjectives in more detail.

3.2 Case study 2: Ability adjectives

3.2.1 Introduction

Icelandic has two types of deverbal ability adjectives, as mentioned above. Below I give an example of two versions of an adjective meaning ‘touchable’:

(92) a. Ability Adjective
    snert-an-leg-ur
    touch-ing-ADJ-M.SG.NOM

b. Ability Participle
    snert-andi
    touch-ing

18 Ability adjectives are found in various languages. English also has two types of ability adjectives, although only one of them is deverbal. An example of the deverbal type is comparable (here ‘ is showing stress, not to be confused with ‘ in Icelandic spelling); the other does not seem to be deverbal, such as cómparable (and is sometimes spelled -ible). The difference between the two becomes clear in (i)–(ii) below (Nevins 2002):

(i) a. Although the sizes of the two fish were cómparable, I couldn’t compare them.
   b. #Although the sizes of the two fish were comparable, I couldn’t compare them.

(ii) a. The trout was much bigger than the guppy; nobody doubted that their sizes were cómparable.
   b. #The trout was much bigger than the guppy; nobody doubted that their sizes were comparable.

As a result of their different internal structure, cómparable and comparable do not mean the same thing: the former means ‘roughly equal’ and the latter ‘able, possible to compare’. On Nevins’ account, cómparable has the head a -able attaching directly to the root √COMPAR whereas comparable has a verbal structure, it is a deverbal adjective. Since comparable is a verb on the inside, it retains the stress of the verb compare, whereas merging √COMPAR directly to an adjectivizer may result in the unpredictable stress pattern found in cómparable.

19 The discussion on Icelandic ability adjectives builds on joint work with Jim Wood, see Wood and E.F. Sigurðsson (2014a).

20 I call them both adjectives here, even though only one of them actually has an adjectivizer a.
In (92a), -leg is an adjectivizer a, glossed here as ADJ. This same -leg is found in various adjectives that do not contain verbal material (e.g., góð-leg-ur ‘good-ADJ-M.SG.NOM; somebody who seems to be good’, Íslendingasagna-leg-ur ‘Icelanders.GEN.sagas.GEN-ADJ-M.SG.NOM; something (presumably a story) that resembles or is like the Icelandic sagas’). -leg is followed by an agreement suffix, which is -ur ‘M.SG.NOM’ in this case. There is no such agreement in (92b), the form is exactly the same for all person and number. Diachronically, at least, -an (92a) and -andi(i) seem to have been related (Jóhannesson 1927:67). Kvaran (2005:140) suggests that in AAs, -leg is added to participle -andi. I will follow that assumption here (cf. also Wood and E.F. Sigurðsson 2014a).

Both of the ability adjectives shown in (92) can be translated into English as ‘touchable’. They cannot be used interchangeably, however, as there is a difference in meaning between them, as shown below.

(93) a. #Pannan the.pan.f.nom er ekki snert-an-leg-∅.
   ‘The pan is not touchable.’ (generally untrue of pans)
b. Pannan the.pan.nom er ekki snert-andi.
   ‘The pan is not touchable (because it is very hot).’
c. Þessi this sjóðandi steaming heita panna er snert-an-leg, en hún er ekki snert-andi.
   ‘This steaming hot pan is touchable, but it’s not “touchable.”’

The meaning of the AA in (93a) is that it is not (physically) possible to touch the pan. This example, with snert-an-leg, is marked with #, as it is not true of pans that they cannot be touched. On the other hand, a comparable example in (93b), with the AP snert-andi, is fine, as it means that the pan should not be touched. The final example, (93c), shows the difference between the two clearly: even though it is possible to touch (snert-an-leg) the pan, it shouldn’t be touched (snert-andi).

The two types, then, differ in modality. Wood and E.F. Sigurðsson (2014a) claim that the ability of APs relates to properties of the understood external argument or the event. Whether the event can happen may depend on the ability of the subject to make it happen. The ability of AAs relates to properties of the theme or the result.

3.2.2 Properties

The two types of ability adjectives discussed here have many interesting properties. I will focus below on their behavior with respect to case and external argument diagnostics.
3.2.2.1 Case

Neither AAs nor APs preserve structural accusative case, as expected. Also, as we have seen, AAs do not preserve quirky case, whereas APs do.

(94) a. Lögin eru ekki breyt-an-leg.
    the.laws.NOM are not change-ing-ADJ
    The laws are not changeable.’

b. Lógnum er ekki breyt-andi
    the.laws.DAT is not change-ing
    ‘The laws are not changeable.’

The verb breyta ‘change’ takes a dative case object in the active. Dative case is, however, only preserved in APs, see (94b), but not in AAs, see (94a).

3.2.2.2 Voice diagnostics

To see what kind of structure there is in APs and AAs, we can try out various well-known diagnostics used to differentiate between eventive passives, stative passives, anticausatives and middles. Below I focus on external argument diagnostics.

Instrumental PPs are a diagnostic for an external argument (e.g., Bruening 2013). These are possible both in AAs and APs.

(95) a. Sláttufjarlægð er breyt-an-leg með yfirtengi dráttarvélar.
    cutting.depth.NOM is change-ing-ADJ with control.rod tractor’s
    ‘The cutting depth is changeable with a tractor’s control rod.’

b. Stjórnmálamönnum er ekki mát-andi með peningum.
    politicians.DAT are not bribe-ing with money
    ‘Politicians are not bribable with money.’

The availability of ‘by’-phrases also diagnoses the presence of an external argument. Interestingly, ‘by’-phrases are allowed in AAs, but are not available in APs, or at least much more restricted.21

(96) a. Einkaþráðurinn er ekki les-an-leg-ur (af neinum).
    the.private.thread.NOM is not read-ing-ADJ-M.SG.NOM by anyone
    ‘The private thread is not readable (by anyone).’

21It should be noted that there are various restrictions on ‘by’-phrases with ability adjectives cross-linguistically (Oltra-Massuet 2010). By-phrases are allowed with English deverbal able-adjectives (e.g., Kayne 1981; Fabb 1984; Roeper 1987), although in at least some cases, the complement of by cannot be an individual:

(i) a. That is deniable by any intelligent person.

b. *That is deniable by Kate. (Oltra-Massuet 2010:62–63)
The reading of (96b) seems to express the speaker’s attitude whereas in (96a), lesanlegur is an individual-level predicate. This difference will be further explored in the dissertation. For now, I assume that both APs and AAs have an unprojected implicit argument in Icelandic, although it should be emphasized that this needs further study.

3.2.3 Current state of the analysis

The problem that AAs pose is that they introduce an external argument but nevertheless dative and genitive cases are not preserved. Nothing should prevent $v_{\text{DAT}}$ from assigning dative to its object.\footnote{It is possible, nevertheless, to propose some sort of impoverishment rule, where $v_{\text{DAT}}$ loses its ability to assign case in the vicinity of a. I do not do that here, however.} It is possible, however, that the theme is merged higher, and not in the complement position of the verb, and that is what I tentatively propose. APs, however, are well-behaved on the assumption that they introduce an external argument.

Wood and Sigurðsson (2014a) analyse the structures of AAs and APs as follows, where the DP originates as the object of the verb in both types of ability adjectives:

\[(97)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{AA} \\
\text{AP}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a.} \\
\text{b.}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
aP \\
XP
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP}_{\text{NOM}} \\
\text{DP}_{\text{DAT}}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
a \\
a'
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{AspP} \\
\text{AspP}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VoiceP} \\
\text{VoiceP}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Asp} \\
\text{Asp}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Voice} \\
\text{vP}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\sqrt{\text{Breyt}} \\
\sqrt{\text{Breyt}}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\textit{an}} \\
\text{\textit{andi}}
\end{array}
\]
While I adopt Wood and Sigurðsson’s (2014a) analysis for APs, my analysis for AAs differ in that on my current account, the DP originates outside aP; the verb does not take any complement and therefore cannot assign dative or genitive case. We need an explanation for why it does not matter for AAs of what type \(v\) is (quirky or structural), unlike in attributive passives, discussed in Chapter 4.

If the DP is merged outside aP, then that seems to be compatible with nominalizations that allow ‘by’-phrases.

(98) Gestum boðið að koma vor og haust með gripi í safnið til grein-ing-ar
     guests invited to come spring and fall with objects to the museum for analyze-n-nInf. GEN
     af sérfræðingum
     by specialists
     ‘Guests invited to come in the spring and the fall with objects to the museum for
diagnosis by specialists.’ (attested)

I will explore the structure of AAs and APs in more detail in the dissertation.

3.2.4 Interim summary

Ability adjectives show an unexpected combination of properties: AAs do not preserve dative or genitive and yet ‘by’-phrases are allowed. To compare this to other constructions, case is also not preserved in stative passives, middles and anti-causatives, but unlike AAs, these do not allow ‘by’-phrases.

APs have the opposite properties: case is preserved but ‘by’-phrases are usually not allowed. With respect to case, APs are like eventive passives for example, which do allow ‘by’-phrases, however. Both APs and AAs allow instrumental phrases, suggesting an external argument. I therefore currently assume that Voice introduces an unprojected external argument in both AAs and APs. However, only in APs do I assume that the DP originates as a complement of the verb.

This will be further explored in the dissertation, as well as what this can tell us about the preservation of case.

3.3 Structural accusative case preserved

As we have seen, Icelandic has non-nominative (quirky/inherent accusative, dative, genitive) subjects in addition to nominative subjects — both inherently case marked and quirky case marked DPs can move to the subject position (SpecTP). Structural accusative DPs usually cannot, however, move to subject position throughout various constructions. This is shown below for the active and the progressive passive (here I use yes/no-questions as a subject test).
This is explained on the present account if accusative is dependent on nominative being assigned in the same domain.

It is therefore unexpected that structural accusative case is found on subjects in Icelandic in certain constructions, namely Existential Accusatives (EAs; H.Á. Sigurðsson 1989, Wood 2015b), the Accusative Tough Construction (AccTC; E.F. Sigurðsson 2015) and Fate Accusatives (FatAcc; H.Á. Sigurðsson 1989, 2006a, Wood 2015c).

One of the problems here is that the accusative DP moving to SpecTP must originally be in the same dependency as a c-commanding element receiving structural case (nominative). It then must move past the nominative case element. I argue that any argument DP can move to SpecTP as long as it can move to a position local enough for T to attract it to its specifier position (see a somewhat similar view in Wood 2015c). By ‘local enough’ I mean that it has to be in the same clause but it cannot A-move past another DP/φ. To be able to manage that, we need an account where the lower (accusative) DP is moved past the higher (nominative) argument. For the AccTC, I propose that this is done via improper movement, where T over-inherits A’-features from C, making SpecTP a mixed A/A’-position (for fuller details, see Sigurðsson 2015; see also van Urk 2015 for Dinka and Longenbaugh 2015 for English tough movement for a similar idea).23


---

23For a discussion on feature inheritance, see Chomsky 2007, 2008; Richards 2007; Obata and Epstein 2008; Legate 2011; Biskup 2014).
that analysis without going into any details of it at present. Comparing Icelandic to Faroese will shed light on the problem, as I show that Faroese has a construction similar to Icelandic EAs, cf. (100a), except that accusative is not preserved, see (101):

(101) Faroese

Hon/*Hana er at finna í Danmark.

she.NOM/*her.ACC is to find in Denmark

‘She is (to be) found in Denmark.’

This is reminiscent of the Faroese data in (17b) above: It is not surprising to see a nominative subject in this structure (assuming a \[case:str\] feature on T). However, it is somewhat surprising that the DP is assigned nominative if it does not move, but stays in situ.

(102) Faroese

Í Klaksvík er at finna ein/*eina framúrskarandi bók um málfroði.
in Klaksvík is to find.INF a.NOM/*a.ACC excellent book about linguistics

‘In Klaksvík, it is possible to get an excellent book about linguistics.’

If there were a WIA or SIA in the external argument position of the infinitival clause, we would expect accusative on the object DP ‘an excellent book about linguistics’. I will look in more detail at this construction in relation to Icelandic EAs in the dissertation.

3.4 Summary

Whereas Chapter 2 discusses various constructions with passive properties where structural accusative case is assigned and \(\phi\)Ps block A-movement to subject position, Chapter 3 focuses on the preservation of case in constructions with mixed properties.

The quirky case generalization (87) states that dative and genitive cases are preserved when Voice introduces an external argument, whether or not it is syntactically projected, or an element in SpecVoiceP is assigned structural case. Ability Adjectives (AAs) pose a potential problem for this generalization as they introduce an implicit external argument and yet dative and genitive are not preserved. On my tentative analysis, the theme DP is not base-generated within the AA structure.

Something different must be said about structural accusative case in subject position: For a DP to be assigned structural accusative case, another element in the same domain must be assigned nominative. This can be obtained if Voice introduces an external argument that is syntactically projected. The theoretically challenging part is to get the accusative DP past the

---

\(^{24}\)Thanks to Hjalmar Petersen, his students and Ragnar Sigurðarson for giving me their native speaker judgments on the Faroese equivalent of the Icelandic EA construction, shown in (101–102). Thanks also to Caitlin Richter for providing me with additional examples from her spoken Faroese corpus.
nominative phrase. There are various ways to implement that, such as via smuggling (Collins 2005) or improper movement, which I will consider for my analysis.

4 Attributive passives and concord

4.1 Introduction

We have up until now been concerned with the interplay of Voice and case in predicative contexts. Attributive passives, on the other hand, pose a surprising problem with respect to the interaction of Voice and case, that has mainly gone unnoticed in the literature:25 Attributive passive participles of quirky case verbs are less acceptable than participles of verbs that take a structural case object. I argue that the reason is twofold: case mismatch between an implicit object of the participle and agreement mismatch on the participle.

Compared to subject-finite verb agreement, concord is poorly understood.26 The Agree operation has turned out to be a successful mechanism to account for the agreement relation established between a DP and a finite verb for example. All approaches to concord must address the question of whether Agree is also at play in concord (Carstens 2000; Baker 2008; Pesetsky 2014; Toosarvandani and van Urk 2014; Landau 2015) or whether a different mechanism is needed, or even a combination of both (Norris 2012, 2014; Baier 2015). Ideally, we should not resort to other derivational mechanisms than Agree.

This chapter discusses a particular type of noun-modifier agreement in Icelandic, which turns out to be challenging for the theory of agreement and concord, in which passive participles modify nouns (as in the driven car). In these, the verb can never assign case to the noun it modifies, not even if it normally assigns dative or genitive case to its argument. Interestingly, dative- and genitive-taking verbs (quirky case verbs) are worse in attributive passives than other verbs that take a structural case object.

(103) **Active**

a. Ég keyrði bílinn. 
I drove the.car.ACC 
‘I drove the car.’

b. Ég ók bílnum. 
I drove the.car.DAT

(104) **Attributive resultative passive**

a. keyrði bíllinn 
 driven the.car.NOM  
‘the driven car’

b. ??ekni bíllinn 
 driven the.car.NOM

The verbs in (103–104), keyra and aka, have the same meaning, ‘drive’. In the active, keyra assigns accusative to its object but aka assigns quirky dative case. However, only the passive

---

25 See, however, Poole (2015).

26 By concord I mean noun-modifier agreement.
participle of the verb that takes an accusative object in the active can be used attributively.

Attributive passives usually have a stative passive reading or a resultative passive reading. Some attributive participles are ambiguous between the two: 27

\[(105)\] 

\[\text{brotní stóllinn} \]

\[\text{broken the.chair} \]

Stative: ‘the broken chair (it is in a broken state)’

Resultative: ‘the broken chair (it is in a state of having become broken)’

**Brjóta** ‘break’ takes an accusative object in the active. The phrase in (105) is ambiguous between a stative and a resultative reading: the former is a pure state reading whereas the latter is a state reading resulting from a previous event. For a verb like *tína* ‘lose’, however, that assigns a dative case to its object in the active, there is a case difference between the stative and the resultative predicative passive. In the stative predicative passive, the DP is assigned nominative, whereas it is assigned dative in the resultative predicative passive.

\[(106)\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. Úrið \quad \text{er týnt. (stative)}} \\
&\quad \text{the.watch.NOM is lost}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. Úrinu \quad \text{er týnt. (resultative)}} \\
&\quad \text{the.watch.DAT is lost}
\end{align*}\]

When the participle of \sqrt{\text{TYN}} is used attributively, only the stative reading is fully grammatical:

\[(107)\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{týnda úrið} \\
&\quad \text{lost the.watch.NOM}
\end{align*}\]

Stative: ‘the lost watch (it is in a lost state)’

Resultative: ‘the lost watch (it is in a state of having become lost)’

This is further evidence that case is a crucial factor in attributive passives. 28

---

27 For stative vs. resultative diagnostics, see Kratzer (2000); Embick (2004a). I will discuss these in the dissertation and introduce new Icelandic-specific diagnostics.

28 The relevance of case will be contrasted with Faroese and Lithuanian. In Lithuanian, dative behaves like a structural case, in that it has a dative to nominative conversion in the passive (i), even when the DP stays in situ (ii).

\[(i)\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. Jon-as vadovauja fabrik-ui.} \\
&\quad \text{Jonas-NOM manages factory-DAT}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. Fabrik-as buvo Jon-o vadovaujam-as} \\
&\quad \text{factory-NOM.SG was John-GEN managed-NOM.SG}
\end{align*}\]

‘Jonas manages the factory.’

‘The factory was managed by Jonas.’

\[(Anderson 2015:289-290)\]

\[(ii)\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Vėlyvu vakra buvo vadovaujam-as fabrik-as Jon-o.} \\
&\quad \text{late evening was managed-NOM.SG factory-NOM.SG John-GEN}
\end{align*}\]

‘Late evening, the factory was managed by John.’

\[(Milena Šeirakeitė, p.c.)\]

Not surprisingly, participles of dative-taking verbs are grammatical in attributive passives:

\[(iii)\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Vaduojami žmonės atrodi nusivylę} \\
&\quad \text{rescued people looked disappointed}
\end{align*}\]

‘The rescued people looked disappointed.’

\[(Milena Šeirakeitė, p.c.)\]
It should be noted that when a subject in the predicative passive is in the nominative case, the passive participle shows nominative agreement, see (108a). When it is in the dative, the participle does not exhibit dative agreement, but rather default or no agreement (108b), even though participles can show dative concord in attributive position (108c) (*farga ‘destroy’ takes a dative argument).

    the.car.NOM.M.SG was driven-NOM.M.SG
    ‘The car was driven.’

b. Bílnum var ekið-∅/*ekn-um.
    the.car.DAT was driven/*driven-DAT
    ‘The car was driven.’

c. Keyrð-um bílum var fargað-∅.
    driven-DAT cars.DAT was destroyed.
    ‘Driven cars were destroyed.’

In the attributive passives in (104), it is debatable whether there is a Voice projection with an implicit argument. ‘By’-phrases are, for example, not possible. The attributive position is, however, often quite limited in how much structure is allowed:

(109) a. The proud man.


I argue that in (104), Voice introduces a syntactically unprojected implicit argument. Verbs like *myrða ‘murder’ seem to introduce an external argument, as argued by Wood (2015a); *myrða forms a grammatical attributive passive participle (e.g., *myrtur maður ‘a murdered man’), suggesting that the attributive passive can introduce an external implicit argument.

The main focus of this chapter is on why passive participles of quirky case verbs are often ungrammatical when they modify nouns (attributive passives). The problem is surprising, given that AAs formed from quirky case verbs are fully grammatical, whereas attributive passives formed from the same verbs are at best marked.

Further theoretical problems have to do with whether the verbal participle takes a null argument of its own (cf. Bruening 2014) and whether there is an implicit agent argument in

These are not grammatical in German, however (Beatrice Santorini, p.c., Alexander Pfaff, p.c.), but presumably for a different reason than in Icelandic, as dative direct objects in German have been argued to be PPs (McFadden 2004) (*schädigen (iv-a) assigns structural case in the active but schaden (iv-b) dative):

(iv) a. der geschädigte Mann
    the.NOM damaged man
    ‘the damaged man’

b. *der geschadete Mann
    (Alexander Pfaff, p.c.)
attributive passives. I touch on these questions below and explore them in much more detail in the dissertation.

If the verb in attributive passives does not take an argument of its own then the main problem must lie in the fact that participles of quirky case verbs do not generally show concord (they do not agree with a dative or genitive DP in predicative passives). If they do take a null argument, then the problem may have to do with the mismatch between the case that the null argument is assigned and the case that the modified noun has.

I will now take a closer look at the problem.

4.2 Case study 3: Case and concord

4.2.1 Nominal concord vs. Agree

To account for cases like *keyrður bíll* ‘a driven car’, we need to address important issues regarding concord. For clarification, examples involving concord are shown below.

(110) a. fjór-ir litl-ir snigl-ar
    four-NOM.M.PL little-NOM.M.PL snail-NOM.M.PL
    ‘four little snails’ (Norris 2012:205)

b. Ég sá fjór-a litl-a snigl-a.
    I saw four-ACC.M.PL little-ACC.M.PL snail-ACC.M.PL
    ‘I saw four little snails.’

c. Ég bjargaði fjór-um litl-um snigl-um.
    I saved four-DAT.M.PL little-DAT.M.PL snail-DAT.M.PL
    ‘I saved four little snails.’

In these examples, we see DP internal agreement. In (110a), all the elements are in the nominative. When the DP is assigned a case other than nominative, all the elements reflect that case, see (110b–c). This is (nominal) concord (also called noun-modifier agreement).

As mentioned above, we must ask the question concerning whether concord is (a part of) the same mechanism as syntactic Agree, such as in subject-verb agreement. Ideally, concord can be accounted for using Agree. I will pursue that in the dissertation.

4.2.2 Agree in syntax, not morphology

An important issue is where the mechanism carrying out concord is. I argue that it is Agree, located in the syntactic component. On my current approach only syntactic derivational features, [*F*] and [●F●], are needed, placing concord in syntax and using Agree.

However, there are several differences between concord and Agree that might suggest they are two different mechanisms (cf. Norris 2014:100–103). For example, subject-verb Agree will usually only show agreement on a finite verb, while nominal concord is often realized in multiple places.
This is unlike DM accounts (e.g., Halle and Marantz 1993; Noyer 1997), where heads that show concord trigger insertion of an agreement (AGR) node in the morphological component. The AGR node is attached to the relevant head; it is not itself a separate head.

(111) AGR node insertion
\[ X \rightarrow [X \ X \ AGR] \]

Norris (2012, 2014), for example, argues for morphological concord. He proposes feature percolation where number, gender and case features are collected by a single head K in the syntax and copied onto agreement nodes in the morphology.\(^{30}\)

In the dissertation, I will explore in more detail the two different approaches to concord.

4.2.3 Analysis

4.2.3.1 An operator analysis in attributive passives
As already shown, when a passive participle of a verb that takes quirky case argument is used attributively, it is less acceptable or grammatical than a participle of a verb with similar meaning that takes structural case argument. In the following discussion about verbs taking quirky case arguments, I will only discuss dative taking verbs.

Following Embick (2004a), I take such participles to be AspP (and not, e.g., aP). I furthermore assume that attributive passives, both resultative and stative, are merged in the same place as adjectives, such as fallegur ‘beautiful’:

(112) hinn fallegi / opni / opnaði / brotni / pakki
    the beautiful / open / opened / broken package

For present purposes, I assume a very simple structure where Asp merges with N (see Ingason 2015 and Pfaff 2015 for recent, detailed analyses of the internal structure of the noun phrase).

An important question arises whether the participle takes an object or not. Bruening (2014) argues for a null operator analysis (lambda abstractor), with movement from an internal argument position to SpecaP. This results in the aP being of type \(\langle e, t \rangle\), the same type as N. That means that aP and N can combine semantically via Predicate Modification.

(113) a proven fact

\(^{30}\)See also Baier (2015) who adopts some of Norris’s mechanisms when accounting for adjectival agreement in Noon (Cangin, Senegal). However, he makes a clear distinction between predicative and attributive agreement.
I adopt Bruening’s (2014) analysis for the problem that Icelandic attributive passive participles pose, arguing for a case and feature mismatch, as now will be discussed.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{31}Applying this analysis to Icelandic may be problematic due to incorporation facts. For the resultative ‘scrub the pans clean’, incorporation is triggered in the attributive passive (i-c) but not in the eventive passive (i-b).

(i) a. Hann skrúbbið pönnurnar hreinar.
   ‘He scrubbed the pans clean.’ (active resultative) (Whelpton 2011:111)

b. Pönnurnar voru skrúbbiðar hreinar.
   ‘The pans were scrubbed clean.’

(c) hrein-skrúbbuðu pönnurnar
   ‘the scrubbed clean pans’

(d) *skrúbbuðu hreinar pönnurnar
   ‘the scrubbed clean pans’

This possibly indicates that the the participle in the attributive passive does not take an object of its own. It is, however, well known that a lot less structure is possible in this position where an element such as an adjective or a participle modifies a noun.

On the assumption that the presence of an argument prohibits incorporation, we would have expected (i-d) over (i-c) if the attributive participle takes an argument (here an operator). We could also assume a difference between operators and overt DPs with respect to incorporation. Note, however, that incorporation is not triggered in the eventive passive in relative clauses, where we, presumably, have an A\textsuperscript{′}-operator. It should be noted here that a relative clause operator behaves like a DP regarding case (this is shown for hjálpa ‘help’ in (ii), which takes a dative object).

(ii) Þetta eru menningir 
    [CP sem var báðum hjálpað-∅ ].
    ‘These are the men who were both helped.’
4.2.3.2 Attributive vs. predicative concord

There is a difference between attributive and predicative concord which has to do with verbs that assign quirky case, such as *fresta* ‘postpone’.\(^{32}\) To the extent that it is possible, quirky case verb participles in attributive position show agreement in gender, number and case with the noun they modify (concord), see (114a). In predicative position (114b), these participles never show such agreement; they show default, or no, agreement.\(^{33}\)

\[(114)\]

\[a. \text{frestað-ir leikir} \quad \text{postponed-NOM.M.PL game-NOM.M.PL} \]
\[\quad \text{‘postponed games’} \]
\[b. \text{Leikjunum er frestað-∅.} \quad \text{the.games.DAT is postponed} \]
\[\quad \text{‘The games are postponed.’} \]

\[(115)\]

\[a. \text{dæmd-ir menn} \quad \text{convicted-NOM.M.SG man.NOM.M.SG} \]
\[\quad \text{‘a convicted man’} \]
\[b. \text{Mennirnir eru dæmd-ir.} \quad \text{the.man.NOM.M.SG are convicted-NOM.M.PL} \]
\[\quad \text{‘The men are convicted.’} \]

Accounting for predicative agreement in (115b), I propose that T’s $\phi$-features are valued by the nominative DP when T probes (Agree). Asp also probes and its unvalued features are also valued by the nominative DP (Agree). In (114b), on the other hand, T probes but as the DP is in the dative, it cannot value T’s $\phi$-features, and T will get default values (Failed Agree; Preminger 2011). Asp also probes but the dative DP cannot value its features (Failed Agree).

I will now suggest an analysis of the attributive agreement in (114a).

---

This might be an indication that in the attributive passive, the verb does not take an argument of its own. This assertion needs further study.

\(^{32}\)Attributive and predicative concord differ also with respect to definiteness. Definiteness is only reflected in attributive position, see (ii-a), but not in predicative position, see (ii-b).

\[(i)\]

\[a. \text{litl-ir snigl-ar} \quad \text{little-M.PL.INDEF snail-M.PL} \]
\[\quad \text{‘little snails’} \]
\[b. \text{Snigl-ar eru litl-ir.} \quad \text{snail-M.PL are little-M.PL.INDEF} \]
\[\quad \text{‘Snails are little.’} \]

\[(ii)\]

\[a. \text{litl-u snigl-ar-nir} \quad \text{little-PL.DEF snails-M-DEF} \]
\[\quad \text{‘the little snails’} \]
\[b. \text{Snigl-ar-nir eru litl-ir / *litl-u.} \quad \text{snails-M-DEF are little-M.PL.INDEF / *little-PL.DEF} \]
\[\quad \text{‘The snails are little.’} \]

Baier (2015) discusses this same type of asymmetry for Noon (Cangin, Senegal), German and Swedish. For present purposes, I ignore this difference.

\(^{33}\)It should be noted, that even though I do not find (114a) perfectly acceptable, this use with *fresta* ‘postpone’ is quite frequent and not ungrammatical.
4.2.3.3 Case and feature mismatch

The unacceptability of the attributive passives of verbs that take dative case may have at least two origins: 1) Attributive passive participles of \( v_{\text{DAT/GEN}} \) assign dative/genitive to their object (the operator). The mismatch in the case of the operator and the whole DP leads to unacceptability. 2) Passive participles that do not normally show agreement do so in attributive position.

First regarding case mismatch, Voice in the syntax does not have \( \phi \)-features to be valued by the object as this is the passive. However, \( v \) has a case feature (originating in the syntax) specified for dative. The operator, base-generated in object position, is assigned dative by \( v_{\text{DAT}} \). Deleting the embedded DP under identity seems to be problematic, at least partly because of case mismatch. What supports this idea is the fact that attributive passives of dative verbs are often better when the whole DP is in the dative case: (116b), where ‘the delayed games’ is in the dative (the verb ljúka ‘finish’ takes a dative argument), is slightly better than (116a), where ‘they delayed games’ is in the nominative.\(^{34}\)

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{(116) a. } & \text{Frestuðu } leikirnir \text{ eru búnir.} \\
& \text{delayed the.games.NOM are finished} \\
& \text{‘The postponed games are finished.’}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{(116) b. } & \text{Frestuðu } leikjunum \text{ er lokið.} \\
& \text{delayed the.games.DAT is finished} \\
& \text{‘The postponed games are finished.’}
\end{align*} \]

This suggests that the problem has to do with case conflict.

However, having the whole DP in the dative case does not always make the attributive passive perfect. Why that is may have to do with the second point raised above: participle agreement. As shown below, there is a difference between passive participles of verbs taking dative in predicative and attributive position.

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{(117) a. } & *frestað-Ø / ?frestað-ir \text{ leikir} \\
& \text{postponed / postponed-NOM.M.PL game-NOM.M.PL} \\
& \text{Intended: ‘postponed games’}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{(117) b. } & \text{Leikjunum var frestað-Ø / *frestuð-um.} \\
& \text{the.games.DAT was postponed / postponed-DAT.PL} \\
& \text{‘The games were postponed.’}
\end{align*} \]

Since the verb assigns dative to the operator, we would expect *frestað-Ø leikir to be grammatical. It is not, suggesting that the problem has to do with agreement conflict.

I will now outline my tentative proposal for examples like ?frestaðir leikir. First, since the participle contains \( v_{\text{DAT}} \), Asp fails to Agree with the dative case operator. Asp will therefore

\(^{34}\)Thanks to Jim Wood (p.c.) and Alec Marantz (p.c.) for independently asking questions about this and bringing my attention to the issue.
get default values. N, however, has structure-building features, [gender] and [number] (for simplicity, gender and number features are placed on N in the tree below rather than placing the number feature on Num). When Asp and N merge, the result is feature stacking as N’s structure-building gender and number features are discharged onto Asp. This is similar to Faroese case stacking (see (18) above). If this is the case, then Asp has valued gender and number features on top of gender and number features with default values, see (118).

\[(118)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Asp} \\
[\text{gender:M}] \\
[\text{number:PL}] \\
[\text{gender:∅}] \\
[\text{number:∅}] \\
\text{Asp Voice} \\
\end{array}
\]

This agreement conflict leads to the unacceptability of the participle. Why exactly that is needs further study, however.

The result of this is that both case and agreement are at play for this problem. It is unfortunate that we cannot tease the two apart in attributive passives. Fortunately, however, there is a way to isolate case to show its relevance in the absence of agreement, as discussed in the next section.

### 4.2.3.4 Ability Participles

One way to show that the attributive passive problem is about case mismatch is with APs, as they do not exhibit concord, in neither predicative nor attributive position. As we saw in Chapter 3, dative and genitive case are preserved in APs. However, when used attributively, APs of dative or genitive taking verbs are not possible.

\[(119)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a. Þessum manni er ó-bjóð-andi.} \\
\text{this.DAT man.DAT is un-invite-ing} \\
\text{‘This man is uninvitable (because he will ruin the party).’} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{b. ??Þetta er ó-bjóð-andi maður.} \\
\text{this is un-invite-ing man} \\
\text{‘This is an uninvitable man.’} \\
\end{array}
\]

However, the example becomes much better when the whole DP is in the dative case.
This suggests that case mismatch matters in attributive passives and attributive APs.

4.3 Summary

In this chapter, I discuss concord. I argue that it can be accounted for by using mechanism we have are already familiar with, syntactic Agree. This chapter discusses an interesting problem for for attributive passive participles of verbs that take quirky case objects. I propose that both agreement mismatch and case mismatch between the modified noun and the embedded null operator is crucial for the analysis.

The dissertation will explore this problem in further detail and, on a more theoretical level, contrast syntactic and morphological approaches to concord.

5 Implications

This dissertation improves our understanding of the interaction of Voice and case, such as when case is assigned and preserved and how. I demonstrate that a syntactic approach that makes a clear distinction between actives and passives in language is too simple, showing how, when and why the dichotomy between actives and passives breaks down.

It has been debated for a long time where case assignment and agreement takes place: in the syntactic or the morphological component. Dependent case theory has been influential, placing case and agreement in morphology, whereas various other approaches place it in the syntax. This dissertation argues for placing Agree and case assignment in syntax whereas a translation of case assignment into a case feature takes place in morphology, using dependent case algorithm. Moreover, linguists do not agree on where concord fits into this picture. I argue that concord can be subsumed under syntactic Agree, reducing the mechanisms we need in linguistic research.

I furthermore refine and improve our understanding of the nature of implicit arguments and how they interact with different Voice types. I argue that implicit arguments are not always projected but when they are, they are assigned case. I extend the makeup of implicit arguments to overtly realized counterparts. This gives way to cross-linguistic research on when φPs are morphologically realized.

In addition to the overall theoretical impact, this dissertation makes important empirical contributions to various constructions in Icelandic (and Faroese), some of which have largely been left unnoticed in the theoretical literature.
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