Scandinavian Presentational Sentences and Subjecthood Handout2

Annie Zaenen

April 12, 2018

1

Scandinavian Presentational Sentences and Subjecthood - Handout

Annie Zaenen
(work done with Elisabet Engdahl and Joan Maling)

Properties of presentational sentences in Swedish and Icelandic

- –> configurationality
- –> factors that influence subjecthood
- –> why do thematic roles constrain information-structure motivated constructions such as presentational sentences

1.1 Introduction

Scandinavian languages are verb-second languages (tensed verb in second position).

Presentational sentences are characterized by an expletive, Það in Icelandic, det in Swedish. Það has to be in the sentence (clause) initial position. Det can occur immediately before or immediately after the tensed verb (in canonical subject positions)

In insular Scandinavian there are two (three) positions for the pivot; in mainland Scandinavian only one (but see Håkansson (2017)):

(1) Það hefur **svartur köttur** alltaf verið í eldhúsinu. (Ice.Thrá 2007) (Mittelfeld pivot)
Það hefur alltaf **svartur köttur** verið í eldhúsinu.(MP)

Það hefur alltaf verið **svartur köttur** í eldhúsinu.(VPpivot)
There has always been a black cat in the kitchen.'

(2) Det   har varit **en katt** i   köket.   (Swed) (VPpivot)
There has been a   kat   in the-kitchen
'there as been a cat in the kitchen.'

Only intransitives?:

Icelandic

(3) Það   hefur alltaf beðið   mín **nukkuð   skemmtilegt**.
There has   always awaited me something amusing
'something amusing always awaited me.'

Swedish

(4) Det   hade tilldelats   studenten   **ett pris**.
EXPL had   award-PASS student-DEF a   reward
'There had been awarded a prize to the student.'

See Zaenen et al. (2017) and Maling (1988) for discussion of thematic constraints on VPpivots in Icelandic.

previous research e.g. Askedal (1986), Lødrup (1999),Börjars and Vincent (2005).

1.2   Word order

	Vorfeld	Mittelfeld				Verbalfeld				
(5)	XP	V [+FIN]	(DP1)	(ADV*)	(DP2)	V [-FIN]	Prt	DP3	DP4	PP*

Topological schema see Diderichsen (1946) and Teleman et al. (1999), Kathol (2004), Müller (2013). Examples are in the compound tense because otherwise one doesn't see where the pivot is.

1.3   Discourse/information structure assumptions

Stage-topic (Erteschik-Shir (to appear)), when expressed it is typically a temporal or spatial adjunct, and aboutness-topics (Reinhart (1981))

(6)   Yesterday, Mary went to San Francisco)
Yesterday: stage-topic; Mary: aboutness-topic

(7)   Yesterday there was a spiderweb in the bathtub.
Yesterday: stage-topic; no aboutness topic

Definiteness

VP internal pivots: more or less like English; we are assuming they are non-specific indefinites (discourse new and hearer new (Prince (1981); Prince (1992)). Mittelfeld pivots (in Icelandic): strong as well as weak quantified DPs. Studied mainly by Vangsnes (2002). Can they be aboutness-topics? We don't know, to be studied!

(8)   Það hefur alltaf verið **(einhver) köttur** í eldhúsinu. (some cat)
Það hefur alltaf verið **svartur köttur** í eldhúsinu. (a black cat)
Það hefur alltaf verið **kettir** í eldhúsinu. (cats)
Það hefur alltaf verið **kötturinn** í eldhúsinu. (the cat)
Það hafa alltaf verið **allir kettir** í eldhúsinu. (all cats)
Það hafa alltaf verið **allir kettirnir** í eldhúsinu. (all the cats)
Það hefur alltaf verið **einn af köttunum** í eldhúsinu. (one of the cats)

(9)   Það hafa alltaf **allir kettir** verið í eldhúsinu. (all cats)
Það hafa alltaf **allir kettirnir** verið í eldhúsinu. (all of the cats)
Það hefur alltaf **einhver köttur** verið í eldhúsinu. (some cat)
Það hefur alltaf **einn af köttunum** verið í eldhúsinu. (one of the cats)
Það hefur alltaf **kötturinn** verið í eldhúsinu. (the cats)
??Það hefur alltaf **köttur** verið í eldhúsinu. (a cat)

(10)   ??**Köttur** hefur alltaf verið í eldhúsinu. (a cat)

Only OK with specific reading

(11)   Í dag hafa **allir kettir** verið í eldhúsinu.
Í dag hefur **kötturinn** verið í eldhúsinu.

but

(12)   ?? Í eldhúsinu hafa **nokkrir kettir** verið í dag. (some cats)
Í eldhúsinu hafa verið **nokkrir kettir** í dag. (some cats)

1.4   Subject properties of active pivots in Icelandic

Subject properties in Icelandic (from ZMT, behavioral properties a la Keenan (1976)

- (position just before or just after the tensed verb)
- reflexivization: with subject controllers reflexivization is obligatory; with object controllers it is dispreferred but possible
- subject ellipsis
- controlled element with infinitival control verbs: cannot be demonstrated
- AcI/ECM/RtoO: infinitival subject shows object case

1.4.1 Reflexives

(13) Það hafa **fjórir   stúdentar**   týnt hjólunum
EXPL have four-NOM students-NOM lost bicycles-the
sínum/*θeirra.
their-refl/*their-non-refl
'Four students have lost their bikes.'

(14) Það hafa aldrei **fjórir   stúdentar**   týnt hjólunum
EXPL have never four-NOM students-NOM lost bicycles-the
sínum/*θeirra   .
their-refl/*their-non-refl
'Four students have never lost their bikes.'

Examples (16) and (17) are adapted from Rögnvaldsson (1983).

(15) Það hafa **margir   furðufuglar**   komið hingað
EXPL have many-NOM strange-fellows-NOM come   here
í   dag með einkennilegar uppfinningar
to day with peculiar   inventions
sínar/*θeirra.   (MP)
their-refl/*their-non-refl
'Many strange fellows have come here today with their peculiar
inventions.'

(16) Það hafa komið **margir   furðufuglar**   hingað
EXPL have come   many-NOM strange-fellows-NOM here
í   dag með einkennilegar uppfinningar
to day with peculiar   inventions
sínar/*θeirra.
their-refl/*their-non-refl (VPpivot)
'Many strange fellows have come here today with their peculiar
inventions.'

1.4.2 Subject ellipsis

(17) Það hafa komið **margir   furðufuglar**   hingað
EXPL have come   many-NOM strange-fellows-NOM here
í   dag og farið í   kröfugönguna.
to day and gone to demonstration-the.
'Many strange fellows have come here today and gone to the
demonstration.'

(18) Við höfum hitt **marga   furðufugla**   og *(θeir
we have   met many-ACC strange-fellows-ACC and they
hafa) farið í   kröfugönguna.
have gone to demonstration-the.

Intended: 'We have met many strange fellows and they have gone to the demonstration.'

Pseudo-coordination or coordination: see e.g. Wiklund (2007), Lødrup (1999), Kinn (2018)).

1.4.3 ECM, Raising to Object or Accusativus cum Infinitivo

(19) Jón telur **hestana** hafa verið í
      John believes horses-the-ACC to-have been in
      kirkjugarðinum.
      churchyard-the
      'John believes the horses to have been in the churchyard.'

(20) Jón telur (*θað) hafa verið **hesta** í
      John believes (*there) to-have been horses-ACC in
      kirkjugarðinum.
      churchyard-the
      'John believes there to have been horses in the churchyard.'

Summary
Not all tests for subject properties that were used for canonical subjects in Zaenen et al. (1985) are applicable to pivots in Icelandic. But the ones that can be used (reflexivization, subject ellipsis and, possibly, raising) show that pivots behave like subjects, regardless of their position.
Position or case?

(21) Það hefur að sögn rekið **nokkra** **hvali** á
      EXPL has to report driven several-ACC whales-ACC to
      land í nótt með kálfum sínum.
      land in night with calves their-refl.
      'Reportedly several whales have stranded overnight with their calves.'

1.5 Configuarationality

(Non)configurationality à la Hale:

- free wordorder
- pro-drop
- discontinuous constituents
- (case marking)

Configurationality à la Haider (2005): positions identify arguments.

Haider (...) p.16: "VO projections are compact, and the highest argument position in the projection (subject argument) needs an external identifier for this argument since it is not within the verb's directional licensing domain."

1.6   Subject properties of active pivots in Swedish

1.6.1   Control of reflexives

(22) **Några studenter** hade kommit ut   från sina/*deras
       some   students   had come   out from REFL/NON-REFL
       kontor.
       offices
       'Some students had come out from their offices.'

(23) **Några studenter** hade körts   ut från sina/*deras
       some   students   had kick.PASS out from REFL/NON-REFL
       kontor.
       offices
       'Some students had been kicked out of their offices.'

(24) Vi hade kört   ut **några studenter** från deras/?sina
       we had kicked out some   students   from NON-REFL/REFL
       kontor.
       offices
       'We had kicked out some students from their offices.'

(25) Det   hade kommit ut **några studenter** från
       EXPL had come   out some   students   from
       sina/*deras   kontor.
       REFL/NON-REFL offices
       'Some students had come out from their offices.'

1.6.2   Subject ellipsis

(26) Vi mötte en flicka och Ø hälsade på henne.
       we met   a girl   and   greeted on her
       'We met a girl and said hello to her.'

(27) Sen mötte vi en flicka och Ø hälsade på henne.
       then met   we a girl   and   greeted on her
       'Then we met a girl and said hello to her.'

This is not possible under identity with an object:

(28) *Vi mötte en flicka och Ø hälsade på oss.
      we met   a girl and   greeted on us
      Intended: 'We met a girl and she said hello to us.'

(29) Hela dagen har det   suttit **en katt** i fönstret   och
      all   day has EXPL sat   a cat in window.DEF and
      (*har) spanat på småfåglarna.
      (*has) looked at small-birds.DEF
      'All day a cat has been sitting in the window, watching the
      small birds.'

Note that the auxiliary is also omitted in the second conjunct.

1.6.3   EMC

(30) Det finns **de**/***dem**   som tycker annorlunda.
      EXPL exist those.NOM/ACC who think   differently
      'There are those who think differently.'

(31) Johan anser   det   troligen kunna   finnas **de**
      John   considers EXPL probable can-INF exist   they-NOM
      som tror   att jorden   är platt.
      that believe that earth-the is flat
      'Johan considers it probable that there exist people who believe
      that the earth is flat.'

(32) Jag anser   dem vara orimliga.
      I   consider them to-be unreasonable.
      'I consider them to be unreasonable.'

(33) Det anses   troligen kunna   finnas de   som
      there is-considered probably can-INF exist   they-Nom that
      tror   att jorden är   platt.
      believe that the   earth is   flat
      'It is considered probable that there exist people that believe
      that the earth is flat.'

1.6.4   Control into infinitival adjuncts

(34) En man satte sig   på bänken   utan   att se sig   för.
      a   man sat   REFL on bench.DEF without to look REFL for
      'A man sat down on the bench without looking.'

(35) Det satte sig   **en man** på bänken   utan   att se
      EXPL sat   REFL a   man on bench.DEF without to look
      sig   för.
      REFL for

'A man sat down on the bench without looking.'

Upshot

Assuming that the Vorfeld and the Mittelfeld are topic positions (under normal stress) and the Verbalfeld is reserved for non topics (again under normal stress), the canonical position in both Icelandic and Swedish is not a simple subject position but a a subject-topic position. The same seems to be the case in Dutch:

(36)   De/??Een jongen heeft over de straat gelopen.
       The/A boy has over the street run.
       Er heeft een/*de jongen over de straat gelopen.
       There has a/the boy over the street run.

1.7 Passive Pivots

First claimed in a reference grammar, Faarlund et al. (1997) p. 846f.: VP-pivots in active clauses behave differently from VP-pivots in passive clauses.

1.7.1 Icelandic

Reflexives

(37)   Það   var fleygt **nokkrum stúdentum** út af skrifstofum
       EXPL was kicked some   students   out of office
       sínum/??θeirra.
       their-refl/non-refl.
       'Some students were kicked out of their offices.'

(38)   Það   var **nokkrum stúdentum** fleygt út af skrifstofum
       EXPL was some   students   kicked out of office
       sínum/?θeirra.
       their-refl/non-refl.
       'Some students were kicked out of their offices.'

Non-reflexive better than predicted under subject hypothesis

Subject ellipsis

There seems to be a lot of variation here.

(39)   Það   hafa verið seldir   **margir**
       EXPL have been sold-MASC.PL many-NOM
       bílar   og fluttir   út til
       cars-NOM-MASC.PL and exported-MASC.PL out to
       Póllands.
       Poland
       'There have been many cars sold and exported to Poland.'

(40) Það   var fleygt **nokkrum   stúdentum** út   af
     EXPL was kicked several-DAT students-DAT out of
     skemmtistaðnum og   *(θeir) urðu æstir.
     nightclub-the   and they   were upset
     Intended: 'Several students were kicked out of the nightclub and
     they were upset.'

better with a Mittelfeld pivot:

(41) Það   var **nokkrum   stúdentum** fleygt út af
     EXPL was several-DAT students-DAT kicked out of
     skemmtistaðnum og   ??(θeir) urðu æstir.
     nightclub-the   and they   were upset
     Intended: 'Several students were kicked out of the nightclub and
     they were upset.'

1.7.2 Swedish

Reflexives

(42) Det   hade körts   ut **några studenter** från
     EXPL had kick-PASS out some   students   from
     sina/?deras   kontor.
     REFL/NON-REFL offices
     'There had been some students kicked out of their offices.'

Subject ellipsis

Pivots in passive sentences don't allow subject ellipsis when the second
conjunct is active.

(43) *Det har bjudits   in **några musiker** till festen   och
     EXPL have invited.PASS in some   musicians to party.DEF and
     blivit   glada
     become glad-PL
     Intended: 'Some musicians has been invited to the party and
     they became glad.'

Some speakers, however, find that subject ellipsis is possible if the sec-
ond conjunct is also passive, as in (44)

(44) Det har sålts   **många bilar** och exporterats   till
     EXPL have sold-PASS many   cars   and exported.PASS to
     Polen.
     Poland
     'There have been many cars sold and exported to Poland.'

Control into Infinitival Adjuncts

The control possibilities are restricted for passives in general:

(45) *En man placerades på bänken   utan   att se   sig   för.
    A   man place-PASS on bench.DEF without to look REFL for
    A man was put down on the bench without looking.

(46) *Det placerades **en man** på bänken   utan   att se
    EXPL place-PASS a   man on bench.DEF without to look
    sig   för.
    REFL for

For several speakers, the following, where both clauses are passive, is grammatical:

(47) Några brev   hade postats   igår   utan   att ha
    some   letters had post-PASS yesterday without to have
    frankerats.
    stamped.PASS

    'Some letters had been mailed yesterday without having had stamps put on.'

The presentational version of this example, however, is judged ungrammatical by most speakers.

(48) *Det hade postats   **några brev** igår   utan   att
    EXPL had post.PASS some   letters yesterday without to
    ha   frankerats.
    have stamped.PASS

Factors such as animacy play a role:

(49) Vilken skandalmatch! I andra halvlek bars   det
    what   scandal-match in second half   carried.PASS EXPL
    ut **en spelare** utan   att vara skadad.
    out a   player   without to be   injured

    'What a scandalous match! In the second period, a player was carried out without being injured.'

Upshot

If one wants to maintain a notion of subject that unifies canonical active and passive subjects with active pivots but excludes passive pivots, one has to appeal to two hierarchies: the lexical one (thematic roles) and the information structural one (topic < ...). The subject has to be 'prominent' on either of these hierarchies: it has to be either a topic or

it has to be the highest lexical argument (where we are assuming that passive does not delete an argument from the lexical argument list). The observation that grammatical functions are sensitive to information-structural factors as well as thematic ones has also be made with very different data in Dalrymple and Nikolaeva (2011).

1.8 Thematic constraints on pivots in Swedish

Intransitives

Theme subject

(50) Det har försvunnit **ett viktigt papper**.
EXPL has disappeared an important paper

'An important paper has disappeared.'

(51) Det kom in **en katt** i köket.
EXPL came in a cat in kitchen.DEF

'A cat came into the kitchen.'

But we also find *agents*

(52) Det har arbetat **två hundra människor** här.
EXPL have worked two hundred people here

'Two hundred people have worked here.'

(53) Det har ringt **någon** till dig.
EXPL has phoned someone to you

'Someone has phoned you.'

However, *experiencers* and *instruments* are not acceptable as pivots:

(54) *Det hade frusit **några barn** i natt.
EXPL had frozen some children in night

Intended: 'Some children had felt cold last night.'

(55) *Det hade skurit **en kniv** igenom väggen.
EXPL had cut a knife through wall.DEF

Intended: 'A knife had cut through the wall.'

Note that the following is grammatical:

(56) Det hade suttit **några barn** utanför och frusit.
EXPL had sat some children outside and frozen

Some children had sat outside and frozen.'

Monotransitives

With active monotransitives the construction is impossible with *agents* regardless of whether the pivot precedes or follows the object.

Agent-Patient

(57) *Det har stulit **någon student** cykeln.
       EXPL has stolen some   student bike.DEF

      Intended: 'Some student has stolen the bike.'

(58) *Det har stulit cykeln   **någon student**.
       EXPL has stolen bike.DEF some   student

      Intended: 'Some student has stolen the bike.'

(59) *Det har hjälpt **en student** den gamle mannen.
       EXPL has helped a   student the old   man.DEF

      Intended: 'A student has helped the old man.'

(60) *Det har   försökt **många** att bestiga berget.
       EXPL have tried   many   to climb   mountain.DEF

      Intended: 'Many people have tried to climb the mountain.'

But if the pivot is a *theme* it may be preceded by an Experiencer or a Goal, as pointed out in Platzack (1983) and Maling (1988) from whom the following examples are taken.

Theme-Experiencer:

(61) Det   hade hänt   honom **något   konstigt**.
       EXPL had happened him   something strange

      'Something strange had happened to him .'

(62) Det   kunde vänta mig **en verklig överraskning** när   jag
       EXPL could await me a   real   surprise   when I
      kom   hem.
      came home

      'A real surprise could be waiting for me when I came home.'

Theme-Goal:

(63) Det   hade nått   Tomas **ett brev** hemifrån.
       EXPL had reached Thomas a   letter from-home

      'A letter from home had reached Thomas.'

(64) Det   har slagit mig **något   intressant**.
       EXPL has struck me something interesting

      'Something interesting has struck me.'

However when the subject/pivot is not the theme, the presentational versions are impossible:

Experiencer-Theme/Stimulus:

(65) *Det hade sett **några studenter** röken.
EXPL had seen some students smoke.DEF
Intended: 'Some students had seen the smoke.'

(66) *Det hade fruktat **många** en ny tsunami.
EXPL had feared many a new tsunami
Intended: 'Many people had feared a new tsunami.'

Goal-Theme:

(67) *Det hade mottagit **en student** priset.
EXPL had received a student prize.DEF
Intended: 'A student received the prize.'

Passive versions of monotransitives:
theme/patient, suppressed agent

(68) Det bjöds in **en musiker** till festen.
EXPL invited-PASS in a musician to party.DEF
'A musician was invited to the party.'

theme-pivot, suppressed active subject is an Experiencer

(69) Det hade setts **rök** i skogen.
EXPL had see-PASS smoke in forest.DEF
'Smoke had been seen in the forest.'

Clear *Goal* pivots in passives are ungrammatical, even when the demoted subject is a theme

(70) *Det hade nåtts **en journalist** av nyheten.
EXPL had reach-PASS a journalist by news.DEF
Intended: 'The news had reached a journalist.'

but the following, where the suppressed subject is an Agent, is grammatical:

(71) Det skulle hjälpas **en man** över gatan.
EXPL should help-PASS a man over street.DEF
'There was a man who needed to be helped over the street.'

In Icelandic, *hjálpa* 'help' takes a dative argument which is assumed to be a Goal. In Swedish, *hjälpa* seems to have been reanalysed as taking a Patient argument, see e.g. Platzack (2005)

Ditransitives

Few ditransitive verbs are used in the passive in Swedish but there are some that are acceptable for most speakers. As shown in Haddican and Holmberg (to appear), these verbs tend to be morphologically complex, like *tilldela* 'award'.

   Goal subject:

(72)   Studenten   hade tilldelats   priset.
       student.DEF had award.PASS prize.DEF
       'The student had been awarded the prize.'

   Theme subject:

(73)   Priset   hade tilldelats   studenten.
       prize.DEF   had award.PASS student.DEF
       'The prize had been awarded to the student.'

But only one presentational version is acceptable, namely the one where the indefinite pivot is the *Theme*:

(74)   Det   hade tilldelats   studenten **ett pris**.
       EXPL had award.PASS him   a   reward
       'There had been awarded a prize to the student.'

(75)   *Det hade tilldelats   **en student** priset.
       EXPL had award.PASS a   student prize.DEF.
       Intended: 'There had been awarded a student the prize.'

This conforms to the pattern we noticed above, that **only theme pivots are possible when there is another NP/DP argument in the Verbalfeld**.

1.9   A mapping account

Acceptable sentences are the result of a negotiation between different grammar components which impose their violable and non-violable constraints on the outcome. For the data at hand: lexical and information-structure layer.

1.9.1   Lexical layer

Assumptions

1. Platzack (2009), Platzack (2010): Swedish verbs can take at most three direct arguments, realized as DP/NPs.
2. cross-linguistically, the lexical layer depends on event-structure; there a two principles that organize event structure: 1. an instigator/cause comes before an effect, 2. an inclination to see human

experience and, human participation in general, as being more central than that of non-humans.

Swedish Thematic hierarchy

There are theme-experiencer and theme-goal verbs, which follows from organizational principle 1 rather than 2. but basically Swedish follows organizational principle 2.

Cf Platzack (2010, 75f.): three 'role families', each associated with a different position in the hierarchical structure.

(76) **HR**(Agent,Cause) < **IR**(Experiencer, Goal, Instrument, Stimulus) < **LR**(Theme, Patient)

We will refer to the first equivalence class as having the high role (HR), to the second as having the intermediate one (IR) and the third as having the low role (LR).

In Swedish the order between arguments in the VP is fixed Haddican and Holmberg (to appear). i.e. it is determined by the lexical structure (but see later):

(77) Vi tilldelade studenten   ett pris.
     we awarded student.DEF a   prize
     'We awarded the student a prize.'

(78) Vi tilldelade en student priset.
     we awarded a student prize.DEF
     'We awarded a student the prize.'

(79) daß er seiner Frau   sein Geld   gegeben hat.
     daß er sein Geld   seiner Frau   gegeben hat.
     that he his   wife-dat his   money-acc given   has
     'that he gave his money to his wife.'

Lexical mapping for a canonical ditransitive sentence:

(80)

Vorfeld	Mittelfeld		Verbalfeld				
XP+HR	V	(DP1)	V	Prt	DP2	DP3	PP*
	[+FIN]	+HR	[-FIN]		+IR	+LR	

Possible presentational structures

- V LR
- V HR
- V IR LR

1.9.2   Information structure

Ultimately, this prominence hierarchy should follow from the fact that discourse normally progresses from what is *given* to what is *new*. For Swedish, we get:

(81)   [Eva$_{\text{ABOUT-TOP}}$] gick till köket.
      Eva   went to kitchen.DEF

      'Eva went to the kitchen.'

(82)   [Sen$_{\text{STAGE-TOP}}$] gick [Eva$_{\text{ABOUT-TOP}}$] till köket.
      then   went Eva   to kitchen.DEF

      'Then Eva went to the kitchen.'

1. topic < completive focus (Choi (1997))
2. topics are -New
3. Completive Foci are +New
4. (+Prom elements do not play a role in the account)

The NP/DP1-position in the Mittelfeld is open to all thematic roles and this is where we find aboutness topics if the Vorfeld is occupied by e.g. a stage topic, see (82) and (87), only subjects-topics are mapped onto NP/DP1. The Verbalfeld is the position for completive foci.

(83)

Vorfeld	Mittelfeld		Verbalfeld				
XP+Top	V [+FIN]	(DP1) +Top	V [-FIN]	Prt	DP2 +ComF	DP3 +ComF	PP*

Discourse constraints on Swedish pivots

Non-specific indefinites rarely function as topics, see Mikkelsen (2002) and Erteschik-Shir (2007). Bare plurals in the Vorfeld tend to get a generic interpretation, referring to the kind rather than to instances of the kind (cf. Carlson (1977)).

(84)   Katter jamar.
      cats   meow

      'Cats meow.'

(85)   Det   lekte   **några barn**   på ängen.
      EXPL played some   children in field.DEF

      'Some children played in the field'

(86)   *Det lekte   **fem av barnen**   på ängen.
      EXPL played five of children.DEF in field.DEF

      Intended: 'Five of the children played in the field'

(87) På eftermiddagen lekte   det   **några barn**   på ängen.
      on afternoon.DEF played EXPL some   children in field.DEF
      'In the afternoon some children played in the field'

(88) Det   har arbetat **två hundra människor** här.
      EXPL have worked two hundred people   here
      'Two hundred people have worked here.'

(89) Det   har ringt   **någon**   till dig.
      EXPL has phoned someone to you
      'Someone has phoned you.'

Anward (1981) and Teleman et al. (1999): agentive subjects modified by Agent oriented adverbs like *motvilligt* 'reluctantly' and *med flit* 'on purpose' are infelicitous in the corresponding presentational versions.

(90) Två hundra människor har   motvilligt arbetat här.
      two hundred people   have reluctantly worked here
      'Two hundred people have reluctantly worked here.'

(91) *Det har motvilligt arbetat **två hundra människor** här.
      EXPL have reluctantly worked two hundred people   here

(92) Någon   har ringt   till dig med flit.
      someone has phoned to you with purpose
      'Someone phoned you on purpose.'

(93) *Det har ringt   **någon**   till dig med flit.
      EXPL has phoned someone to you with purpose

Similarly, manner adverbs are fine with canonical subjects but sound strange in presentational constructions (see Teleman et al. (1999, 3:400)).

(94) Många islänningar sjöng entusiastiskt   på matchen.
      many Icelanders sang enthusiastically at match.DEF
      'Many Icelanders sang enthusiastically at the match.'

(95) ?*Det sjöng **många islänningar** entusiastiskt   på
      EXPL sang many   Icelanders   enthusiastically at
      matchen.
      match.DEF

1.9.3   Mapping

The unmarked lexical order is (where HR stands for High Role, IR for Intermediate Role, and LR for Low Role).

(96) HR(Agent,Cause) < IR(Experiencer, Goal, Instrument, Stimulus) < LR(Theme, Patient)

The unmarked discourse order is

1. topic < completive focus (Choi (1997))

2. topics are -New

3. Completive Foci are +New

4. (+Prom elements do not play a role in the account)

When both the lexical and the information structure are aligned, we get a line-up in which the highest lexical role is mapped to a topic in the Vorfeld or Mittelfeld and the other lexical roles to non-topic positions in the Verbalfeld. This is what we find in canonical transitive and ditransitive sentences. In languages such as Swedish, this least marked line-up corresponds to the categorical structure, which seems to be the most prevalent and often the only one that is recognized. In this alignment, the highest lexical argument of the verb maps outside the VP, onto a canonical subject position. Choi (1997) assumes a CANON constraint to achieve this alignment.

Presentational Mapping assumptions

:

- The highest lexical argument is a non-specific indefinite and hence does not qualify as a topic.

- The pivot is mapped to the lowest VP position (DP3) "because" it is the position for +New/-Prom Completive Focus element.

- The pivot is mapped on the DP3 position (not just the final VP position in surface order).

- The ordering constraints on lexical roles hold in the Verbalfeld even in presentational construction: *IR < HR; *LR < IR

(97)

Vorfeld	Mittelfeld		Verbalfeld				
XP+Top	V [+FIN]	(DP1) +Top	V [-FIN]	Prt	DP2 IR/ComF	DP3 ComF	PP*

- *HR – NP/DP2

- *LR – NP/DP2

- *IR – NP/DP3

- *IR < HR

References

Anward, Jan. 1981. *Functions of passive and impersonal constructions. A case study from Swedish*. Ph.D. dissertation, Uppsala University.

Askedal, John Ole. 1986. Ergativity in modern norwegian. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics,9* pages 25–45.

Börjars, Kersti and Nigel Vincent. 2005. Position versus function in Scandinavian presentational constructions. In M. Butt and T. King, eds., *Proceedings of the LFG05 Conference*, pages 54–72. CSLI.

Carlson, Greg. N. 1977. *Reference to Kinds in English*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Massachusetts.

Choi, H.-W. 1997. Information structure, phrase structure, and their interface .

Dalrymple, Mary and Irena Nikolaeva. 2011. *Objects and information structure*. Cambridge University Press.

Diderichsen, Paul. 1946. *Elementær Dansk Grammatik [Elementary Danish Grammar]*. Gyldendal.

Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 2007. *Information Structure. The Syntax-Discourse Interface*. Oxford University Press.

Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. to appear. Stage topics and their architecture. In V. Molnár and S. Winkler, eds., *Architecture of Topic*. de Gruyter.

Faarlund, Jan Terje, Svein Lie, and Kjell Ivar Vannebo. 1997. *Norsk referansegrammatikk*. Universitetsforlaget.

Haddican, William and Anders Holmberg. to appear. Object symmetry effects in Germanic: Evidence for the role of case. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 62.

Haider, Hubert. 2005. How to turn german into icelandic - and derive the ov-vo contrasts. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics 8* .

Håkansson, David. 2017. Transitive expletive constructions in swedish. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 40(3).

Kathol, Andreas. 2004. *Linear Syntax*. Oxford University Press.

Keenan, Edward. 1976. Towards a universal definition of subject. In C. Li, ed., *Subject and Topic*, pages 303–333. Academic Press.

Kinn, Torodd. 2018. Asymmetric verb phrase coordination in norwegian. degrees of grammaticalization and constructional variants. In E. Coussé, P. Andersson, and J. Olofsson, eds., *Grammaticalization meets Construction Grammar*. John Benjamins.

Lødrup, Helge. 1999. Linking and optimality in the norwegian presentational focus construction. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 22:205–230.

Maling, Joan. 1988. Variations on a theme: Existential sentences in Swedish and Icelandic. In *McGill Working Papers in Linguistics*, pages 168–191.

Mikkelsen, Line. 2002. Reanalyzing the definiteness effect: Evidence from danish. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 69:1–75.

Müller, Stefan. 2013. *Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar: Eine Einführung*. Stauffenburg.

Platzack, Christer. 1983. Existential sentences in English, Swedish, German and Icelandic. In F. Karlsson, ed., *Papers from the seventh Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*, pages 80–100.

Platzack, Christer. 2005. The object of verbs like help and an apparent violation of UTAH. In H. Broekhuis, N. Corver, R. Huybregts, U. Kleinhenz, and J. Koster, eds., *Organizing Grammar. Linguistic Studies in Honor of Henk van Riemsdijk*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Platzack, Christer. 2009. Towards a minimal argument structure. In P. Bernardini, V. Egerland, and J. Granfeldt, eds., *Mélanges plurilingues offerts à Suzanne Schlyter à l'occasion de son 75ème anniversaire*, pages 353–371. Lund University: Språk- och litteraturcentrum.

Platzack, Christer. 2010. *Den fantastiska grammatiken. En minimalistisk beskrivning av svenskan*. Norstedts.

Prince, Ellen. 1981. Toward a taxonomy of given-new information. In P. Cole, ed., *Radical Pragmatics*, pages 223–255. Academic Press.

Prince, Ellen. 1992. The ZPG letter: Subjects, definiteness, and information-status. In W. C. Mann and S. A. Thompson, eds., *Discourse Description: Diverse linguistic analyses of a fund-raising text*, pages 295–326. John Benjamins.

Reinhart, Tanya. 1981. Pragmatics and linguistics: An analysis of sentence topics. *Philosophica* 27(1):53–94.

Rögnvaldsson, Eiríkur. 1983. Sagnliðurinn í íslensku. *Íslenskt mál, 5:7-28* .

Teleman, Ulf, Staffan Hellberg, and Erik Andersson. 1999. *Svenska Akademiens grammatik*. Norstedts.

Vangsnes, Øystein. 2002. Icelandic expletive constructions and the distribution of subject types. In P. Svenonius, ed., *Subjects, Expletives, and the EPP*, pages 43–70. Oxford University Press.

Wiklund, Anna-Lena. 2007. *The Syntax of Tenselessness*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Zaenen, Annie, Elisabet Engdahl, and Joan Maling. 2017. Subject properties in presentational sentences in Icelandic and Swedish. In V. Rosén and K. D. Smedt, eds., *The very model of a modern linguist*, BeLLS 8, pages 260–281.

Zaenen, Annie, Joan Maling, and Höskuldur Thráinsson. 1985. Case and grammatical functions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3(4):441–483.