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Purpose and organization of the talk

**Purpose:**
- To **broaden the data base** of the discussion of Scandinavian OS by adding some (previously unknown or disregarded) details about (Older) Icelandic and Faroese
- **Reevaluate some claims** about OS in the light of these (partially new) data

**Organization:**
- NPOS in (Older) Icelandic revisited
- NPOS in Faroese revisited
- Some concluding remarks
A Problem

The standard view:

• Modern Icelandic has NPOS and PronOS whereas Mainland Scandinavian typically only has PronOS.
• It would seem promising to relate this somehow to the obvious morphological differences between MI on the one hand and MSc on the other (cf. e.g. Holmberg and Platzack 1995).

A puzzle (or at least an apparent one):

• Why doesn’t (the morphologically rich) Old Norse seem to have NPOS (cf. Mason 1999, Haugan 2000, Sundquist 2002)?
Some data sources

Mörkuð íslensk málheild ‘A tagged corpus of Icelandic’
(responsible: Sigrún Helgadóttir, ÁM Institute, sigruhel@hi.is).

21st century Icelandic (17,692,940 words):
• 154 books (6,786,611 words)
• Morgunblaðið (a newspaper) 2002–2008 (5,840,345 words)
• Fréttablaðið (a newspaper), 18 issues 2002–2007 (580,595 words)
• News (manuscripts, radio and TV) 2000–2006 (314,203 words)
• Vísindavefurinn (short “scholarly” articles on the Internet from 39 scholars (1,952,344 words)
• Blog texts, Summer 2006 (different bloggers, 2,218,842)

Old Icelandic (1,659,285 words, freely accessible):
• 44 Icelandic sagas, most of them written in the 14th and 15th century

20th century Icelandic (approx. 500,000 words, freely accessible):
• Excerpts of 100 texts of different kinds from 1980–1989 (about 5000 words from each) used for a frequency dictionary 1991
Icelandic Parsed Historical Corpus (IcePaHC)
(responsible: Joel Wallenberg, Anton Karl Ingason, Einar Freyr Sigurðsson, Eiríkur Rögnvaldsson): 1,002,361 words

- approx. 100,000 word samples/century 12th – 21st century (some 80,000 narrative + 20,000 religious texts, cf. Rögnvaldsson et al. 2011:144):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th>nar</th>
<th>rel</th>
<th>bio</th>
<th>sci</th>
<th>law</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40871</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4439</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td>93463</td>
<td>21196</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6183</td>
<td>120842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>77370</td>
<td>21315</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>111560</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>111560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>35733</td>
<td>60464</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>46281</td>
<td>28134</td>
<td>52997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>63322</td>
<td>22963</td>
<td>22099</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th</td>
<td>100362</td>
<td>20370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3268</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>124000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th</td>
<td>103921</td>
<td>21234</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td>43102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>675114</td>
<td>236547</td>
<td>75096</td>
<td>7707</td>
<td>6183</td>
<td>1000647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data sources, 3

Faroese data:

• Informant work when working on *Faroese – An Overview and Reference Grammar* (Thráinsson et al. 2012 [2004], henceforth FORG).

• Informant work in connection with the *Scandinavian Dialect Syntax* (ScanDiaSyn) project and NORMS (Nordic Center of Excellence in Microcomparative Syntax), including some large scale surveys (cf. Thráinsson 2010).
NPOS in Old(er) Icelandic

Mason (1999): one expl. of NPOS in her Old Norse corpus (she thought she had found two (she had 198 tokens of DOs); Sundquist (2002:333) points out that one was misanalyzed):

(1) at hann gefi **beim manni** aldri fríun, er myrðan hefir ...
that he give that man never peace, that murdered has ...

As Holmberg and Platzack (H&P) point out (1995:172, cf. also Sundquist 2002:332–333), this kind of NPOS is also found in “Norwegian and some varieties of Swedish” (although not in Danish and in other varieties of Swedish, whatever that means):

(2) De ga **Marit** ikke blomstene.
they gave Marit not the-flowers
NPOS in Old(er) Icelandic, 2

**Haugan (2000, section 4.3):**
- I have not been able to find Old Norse examples with both a sentence adverbial and a shifted (full) NP, which might be due to my searching method.

**Sundquist (2002:333) concludes:**
- “Thus other analyses of Old Norse agree with the results here: full DP object shift is not an option in earlier stages of Mainland Scandinavian.”
Rögnvaldsson and Helgadóttir (2011):
• Found (at least) 9 examples of genuine NPOS in the Tagged Corpus of Old Icelandic (cf. slide 4), including:

(3) a Nú leita þeir um skóginn og finna Gísla eigi
now search they through the-wood and find Gísli(A) not
b er hann dræpi þórð eigi og förunauta hans
that he killed Thord(A) not and companions his

One could also look for ECM-examples and causatives etc. (cf. Holmberg 1986; Vikner 2005: section 3.3):

(4) a [Skeggi] lét Eiði bó ráða.
Skeggi let Eidur(A) nevertheless decide
b honum þykir Vémundur jafnan valda því er illa er
him(D) seems Vemundur(N) always cause that which bad is
Frequency of NPOS in Icelandic

Question:
• Aren’t 9 unambiguous examples of NPOS in 44 Icelandic sagas (over 1.6 million words) just a negligible numer?

Searching IcePaHC:
• Searching for full NPOS examples with negation or the adverb aldrei ‘never’ (this is what previous studies typically looked for) throughout the centuries (approx. 100.000 words/century):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th>NPOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion:
• NPOS is very rare in written texts throughout!
NPOS in IcePaHC

The examples:

(5)a Þeir finna Guð aldregi. (Homilies, 1150)
they find God(A) never

b honum gekk Ketilríður aldrei úr hug (Vigl. 1400)
him(D) went Ketilridur(N) never from mind

c úr því sá ég Níels ... aldrei meir (Indíafari 1661)
from that saw I Niels(A) never again

d elskum vér Guð ekki fullkomlega sem skyldum (Gerhard 1630)
love we God(A) not completely as should

e [þær] fóru Guðmundi ekki sem best (Piltur 1850)
they suited Gudmundur(D) not as best

f ég sá þessa menn ekki aftur (Marg saga 1985)
I saw these men(A) not again
More on NPOS in Modern Icelandic

The Frequency Dictionary Corpus (≈ 500,000 words):
• some 5 examples of NPOS w. the negation or *aldrei*,
  18 corresponding ones with the reverse order (Adv – Obj.)

(6)a Fleira gerðist nú ekki og ég sá þessa menn ekki aftur
more happened now not and I saw these men not again
b rík tilhneiging hjá dómstóllum að rífa þönn ekki úr ...
rich tendency with courts to remove children not from

c Gerlach taldi Íslendingum ekki alls varnað
Gerlach believed Icelanders not of-everything prevented (‘no good’)
d En Týri lét þessi ummæli ekki spilla gleði sinni
but Tyri let these remarks not spoil gladness his

e En það kom aldrei neinn.
but there came never anybody

Bergbúarnir sóttu matinn aldrei fyrr en hún
the-cliff-dwellers fetched the-food never until she
More on NPOS in Modern Icel., 2

Proposals about the semantics of OS (and Scrambling) — two possible formulations:

A: The shifted NPs have a **definite/specific/strong** or **[-focus]** reading

B: Objects that have a **definite/specific/strong** or **[-focus]** reading must shift (if syntactically possible)

see e.g. the overviews in Thráinsson (2001:188ff., 2007:75ff.) and Vikner (2005: section 5) and refs. cited there (cf. also the refs. below to work by de Hoop, Diesing, Jelinek, Vikner (1997 and later), Engels, Holmberg (1999), Erteschik-Shir, Andréasson, etc.).

The examples of shifted NPs in (6) would seem consistent with this.
More on NPOS in Modern Icel., 3

Examples of non-shifted objects in the corpus:

(7)a Ég sá ekki eyrun.
   I saw not the-ears

b Passaðu bara að týna ekki húslyklinum.
take-care just to lose not the-housekey

c Þeir þoldu ekki spennuna.
they stood not the-pressure

d [ég] hata allt kerfi þjóðfélagsins ... ég les aldrei blöðin.
I hate all system the-society’s I read never the-papers

(8)a framlengja frestinn en [þeir] ... virða ekki framlenginguna
   extend the-deadline but they respect not the-extension

b eignast annað [barn] ... Nei. Ég læt ekki barnið mitt frá mér
   have another child no I give not the-child my from me

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

All equally consistent with the stronger proposal?
More on NPOS in Modern Icel., 4

More on the semantics:

- The examples in (9) are unambiguous (in the relevant sense) the ones in (10) not (cf. Thráinsson 2001:193, 2007:78–79):

(9)a  Ég las þrjár bækur ekki.
     I read three books not ('There are 3 specific books ...')
     b  Þau sýna viðtöl við Obama alltaf klukkan 11.
        they show interviews w. O. always clock 11
        ('Whenever there are interviews with O. they ...')

(10)a  Ég las ekki þrjár bækur.
       I read not three books ('It is not true that...'/ 'There are 3 ...')
       b  Þau sýna alltaf viðtöl við Obama klukkan 11.
         they show always interviews w. O. clock 11
         ('Whenever ther are ...' / 'It is always the case that ...')

Engels and Vikner (1997:9) on an unattested language:

- A language in which weak pronouns move obligatorily while movement of defocused complex phrases is optional.
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*NPOS in Faroese

Some evidence for “the Faroese puzzle” (lack of NPOS):
- Reports in the literature:

(11)a  Jógvan keypti íkki bókina.
Jogvan bought not the-book(A)

b  *Jógvan keypti bókina íkki. (Barnes 1992:28)

(12)a  Jógvan kennir íkki Siggu.
Jogvan knows not Sigga(A)

b  *Jógvan kennir Siggu íkki. (H&P 1995:172)

(13)a  Zakaris hjálpti aldri Hjalmari.
Zakaris helped never Hjalmar(D)

b  ?*Zakaris hjálpti Hjalmari aldri. (FORG:245)
A variation survey (a part of ScanDiaSyn and NORMS):
A written survey where the subjects were asked to check one of three boxes as defined below (cf. Thráinsson 2009, 2010):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>‘Yes’</th>
<th>‘Common/possible sentence. I could easily have said this.’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>‘Doubtful sentence. I would hardly say this.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nei</td>
<td>‘No’</td>
<td>‘Impossible sentence. I would not have said this.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Nei</th>
<th>Viðmerkingar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Tað hevur eitt par dansað í garðinum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Höskuldur Thráinsson
March 22, 2012
Some results of the (first) survey (a pilot study — no significant diffs. between age groups nor the 6 places visited):

*Table 1: Acceptance of NPOS and comparable examples.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Jens hjálpti <strong>aldri</strong> <strong>Zakaris.</strong>&lt;br&gt;Jens helped never Zakaris(D)</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Jens hjálpti <strong>Zakaris</strong> <strong>aldri.</strong></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td><strong>86.0</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Hann át <strong>ikki</strong> <strong>matpakkan.</strong>&lt;br&gt;he ate not the-lunch-pack(A)</td>
<td><strong>94.3</strong></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Hann drakk <strong>mjólkina</strong> <strong>ikki.</strong>&lt;br&gt;he drank the-milk(A) not</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td><strong>91.2</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Zakari's hjálpti <strong>honum ongantíø.</strong>&lt;br&gt;Zakaris helped him(D) never</td>
<td><strong>91.8</strong></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*NPOS in Faroese: Weak m-case?

A proposal to solve the Faroese puzzle:
• NPOS is only possible in languages with rich (and strong) morphological case (m-case), e.g. Icelandic, but Faroese has weak(er) m-case “which does not suffice to provide a DP with inherent Case value (in the sense discussed)” (H&P 1995:173)

First piece of evidence: lack of case preservation in the Faroese passive (cf. also FORG:266ff.):

(14)a  Þeir hjálpuðu honum.  (Ice.)
       they helped him(D)

   b  Honum var hjálpað.     / *Hann varð hjálpaður.
       him(D) was helped(n.sg.) / he(N) was helped(m.sg.)

(15)a  Tey hjálptu honum.  (Far.)
       they helped him(D)

   b  *Honum varð hjálpt.     / Hann varð hjálptur.
       him(D) was helped(n.sg.) / he(N) was helped(m.sg.)
NPOS in Faroese: Weak m-case?, 2

A problem with the case non-preservation argument:

- m-case sometimes has to be preserved in Far. passives (cf. FORG:267, Thráinsson 2009:4):

(16)a  Teir takkaðu honum.
  they thanked him(D)

  b  Honum varð/bleiv takkað. / *Hann varð/bleiv takkaður.
      him(D) was thanked(n.sg.)/ he(N) was thanked (m.sg.)

(17)a  Tey trúðu henni ongantíð.
  they believed her(D) perhaps never

  b  Henni varð ongantíð trúð. / *Hon varð ongantíð trúð.
      she(D) was never believed / her(N) was never believed

But this lexical variation is obviously a puzzle in itself!
Second piece of evidence: (apparent) lack of case-preservation in the ECM-construction (H&P 1995:173):

(18)a  Mér líkar mjólkin.  
       me(D) likes the-milk(N)  
  b Hann telur mér líka mjókin.  
      he believes me(D) like the-milk(N)  

(19)a  Mær dámar mjólkina.  
       me(D) likes the-milk(A)  
  b Hann heldur meg dáma mjólkina.  
      he believes me(A) like the-milk(A)
**NPOS in Faroese: Weak m-case?, 4**

A problem with the ECM-argument (cf. also Thráinsson 2009:4–5):

- Many speakers allow either Nom or Dat subjects with *dáma* ‘like’ and some other verbs. For such speakers the following should hold (i.e. preservation of Dat subject or substitution of Acc for Nom):

\[(20)\]

(i) **Mær** dámar/ **Eg** dámi mjólkina.

*me(D) likes / I(N) like the-milk(A)*

(ii) **Hann** heldur **mær/meg** dáma mjólkina.

*he believes me(D/A) like the-milk(A)*

This predicts correctly that if a verb exclusively takes a Dat subject, then only Dat will be possible in the ECM-construction:

\[(21)\]

(i) **Mær** hóvar/* **Eg** hóvi hetta best.

*me(D) likes / I(N) like this best*

(ii) **Hann** heldur **mær/*meg** hóva hetta best.

*he believes me(D/*A) like this best*
Another proposal to solve the Faroese puzzle:
• OS is phonological in nature. The reason Faroese differs from Icelandic w.r.t. the possibility of having NPOS is because of a crucial difference in the stress and intonation system of the two languages, especially in compounds (Erteschik-Shir 2010:78–80).

First part of the argument:
• In PronOS the weak pronoun typically “prosodically incorporates” (PIs) into the verb, hence can (or must) precede the adverb. In Icelandic constructions with a full NP object and an adverb “the negative adverb and the object form a prosodic unit in both orders”, i.e. either as Obj-Adv (shifted) or Adv-Obj (unshifted).
*NPOS in Faroese: Stress and intonation?, 2

E-S’s evidence for the PI in Icelandic Obj-Adv/Adv-Obj constructions:
E-S’s stress pattern (2010:79) for Icelandic object constructions after PI (cf. her (64)):

(22)a Jón las 'bókina+ˌekki
Jon read the-book not

b Jón las 'ekki+ˌbókina
Jon read not the-book

Problem:
•While (22a) (and the corresponding diagram on the preceding slide) is probably correct, (22b) (cf. also the corresponding diagram) is not the normal way of saying this (although possible if one stresses ekkī). The normal way would be to PI the adverb into the verb (as in Danish, according to E-S).
Second part of the argument (cf. E-S 2010:79–80):
• “Having initial stress [like Icelandic — and Faroese for the most part] might enable a language to tolerate a longer sequence of syllables without primary stress ... thus allowing for longer prosodically incorporated strings.” Hence the possibility of PI of full NPs and adverbs in NPOS in Icelandic. But this might not be possible in Faroese because in Faroese there is a productive rule of stress shift onto the second element of the compound, witness the stress pattern of certain compounds borrowed from Danish (E-S cites Árnason 1996 on this).
Problem: This characterization of the Faroese stress and intonation system is not accurate:

- Although Faroese is somewhat more “liberal” in its stress pattern than Icelandic, the basic rules are the same:
  1. **the stress alternation rule**: initial stress with some stress on odd numbered syllables (cf. FORG:28, Árnason 2011:90)
  2. **the compound stress rule**: secondary stress on the second part of a compound noun (Lockwood 1955:8, FORG:28, Árnason 2011:275ff.)

Sometimes these rules clash and then it may vary which one wins out. But Faroese is much more liberal than Icelandic in preserving foreign stress patterns in loanwords (cf. FORG:29–30), although it sometimes “chooses its own pattern” (Árnason 2011:281).
Faroese allows a **large number of stress patterns** in compounds, such as the following (where 3 = primary stress, 2 = secondary stress, 1 = no stress, cf. FORG:28). Compounding is productive. Given this, it is **not very likely** that PI of NP and Adv in NPOS “would be unpronounceable” in Faroese, as suggested by E-S (2010:80) any more than in Icelandic (where the patterns are similar):

- a. bisyllabic part + monosyllabic part, pattern 3-1-2: `meitilberg` ‘steep rock wall’
- b. two bisyllabic parts, 3-1-2-1: `grindahvalur` ‘pilot whale’
- c. bisyllabic + trisyllabic, 3-1-2-1-2: `meitilberginum` ‘the steep rock wall (D)’
- d. monosyllabic + monosyllabic, 3-2: `Íslund` ‘Iceland’
- e. monosyllabic + bisyllabic, 3-2-1: `islendskur` ‘Icelandic’
- f. trisyllabic + monosyllabic, 3-1-1-2: `kjallaradyr` ‘cellar door’
- g. trisyllabic + bisyllabic, 3-1-1-2-1: `kjallarabúgvi` ‘cellar dweller’
Conclusion:
• No really convincing proposals have been put forward explaining the apparent ungrammaticality of NPOS in Faroese.

A possibility:
• Maybe NPOS is possible in Faroese (just as it was in Old Norse). We just haven’t looked for it in the right places or provided the right context.
NPOS in Faroese

Holmberg’s original insight (1986:222–223):

• “Raising to Object” in Scandinavian is Object Shift (H’s judgm.):

(22)a  Dom anser  honom alla vara dum.    (Sw)
they consider  him(A) all be(inf.) stupid

b  *Dom anser  Gunnar alla vara dum.
they consider  Gunnar all be(inf.) stupid

c  Dom anser  alla honom/Gunnar vara dum.
they believe  all him(A) /Gunnar be(inf.) stupid

(23)a  Þeir telja  hann allir vera heimskan. (Icel)
they consider  him(A) all(N) be(inf.) stupid(A)

b  Þeir telja  Harald allir vera heimskan
they consider  Harold(A) all(N) be(inf.) stupid

c  Þeir telja  allir ??hann/Harald vera heimskan.
they consider  all(N) him(A)/Harold/A be(inf.) stupid
NPOS in Faroese, 2

This pattern extends to causative verbs and perception verbs (cf. Vikner 2005: section 3.3; the following examples based on his and his judgments):

(24)a Pétur sá þá áreiðanlega vinna Hauka. (Icel)
Peter saw them undoubtedly beat(inf.) Haukar(A)

b Pétur sá Val áreiðanlega vinna Hauka.
Peter saw Valur(A) undoubtedly beat(inf.) Haukar(A)

c Pétur sá áreiðanlega *þá/Val vinna Hauka.
Peter saw undoubtedly them(A)/Valur(A) beat(inf.) Haukar(A)

(25)a Peter så dem formentlig slå FC København. (Da)
Peter saw them(A) presumably beat(inf.) FC Copenhagen.

b *Peter så AGF formentlig slå FC København.
Peter saw AGF presumably beat(inf.) FC Copenhagen.

c Peter så formentlig *dem/AGF slå FC København.
Peter saw presumably them(A)/AGF beat(inf.) FC Copenhagen.
ECM/causative/perception constructions in Faroese:

(26)a  Eg haldi gentuna vera úrmæling.  (FORG:313)
I believe the-girl(A) be(inf.) genius(A)
b Hann sá hana leypa yvir um gøtuna.
he saw her(A) run(inf.) over the-street
c Vit hoyrdu hana syngja.
we heard her(A) sing(inf.)
d Hon læt hann vaska upp.
she made him(A) wash up

(27)a √/√ Eg helt gentuna ongantíð vera úrmæling.
I believed the-girl never be(inf.) genius(A)
b √/? Vit sóu drongin ongantíð leypa yvir um gøtuna.
we saw the-boy(A) never run(inf.) across the-street
c √/* Vit hoyrdu flogfarið ikki koma.
we heard the-plane(A) not come(inf.)
d √/? Hon læt sonin altíð vaska upp.
she made the-son(A) always wash up

(Judgments from two speakers.)
NPOS in Faroese, 4

The speakers consulted agree that:

• It is more natural in examples like the ones in (27) to have the NP follow the adverb (i.e., unshifted full NP is more natural than shifted)
• Examples like the ones in (27) would be fine with a pronoun instead of the full NP (PronOS)
• A pronoun can follow the adverb in sentences like the ones in (27) if it is emphasized but not if it is unstressed (i.e., shifting unstressed pronouns is obligatory in this context)
• But NPOS-examples also improve with stress on the shifted NP:

(28) Hon læt SONIN altíð koyra bilin, ongantíð dótttrina.
     she made the-son(A) always drive the-car, never the-daughter(A)
NPOS in Faroese, °5

Some things to test further in Faroese:

• How real is this apparent difference between “simple NPOS” and NPOS in more complex structures (ECM, causative constructions, perception verbs)?
• What is the extent of the speaker variation observed here — and what is it related to (V-to-I, TEC ...?, cf. proposals in many of the refs. cited above, also Richards 2007)?
• How, or to what extent, do stress and intonation influence the acceptability of NPOS?
• Do NPOS examples improve in the typical NPOS-context (old information, non-focus ...)?
Some concluding remarks

• The non-attestation of full NPOS in a given corpus need not mean that NPOS was “not an option” for the speakers (writers) involved since NPOS is quite rare even in Modern Icelandic prose.
• While shifted NP-objects in NPOS in Icelandic can only have the “strong/definite/specific/non-focus ...”, unshifted NP objects are ambiguous in this respect.
• Since proposed accounts of the (apparent) ungrammaticality of NPOS in Faroese do not seem to work so well, one obvious alternative is to look more carefully for NPOS in Faroese and study its nature. It turns out that some speakers accept some instances of it. But this needs to be investigated in more detail.
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